REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 313
VT 004 091

STUDY OF THE MEANING, EXPERIENCE, AND EFFECTS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ON NEGRO YOUTH WHO ARE SEEKING WORK. PART II, A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF WORK-SEEKING NEGRO YOUNG MEN WHO ARE NOT PLACED IN JOBS BY INTAKE CENTERS.
BY- HERMAN, MELVIN   SADOFSKY, STANLEY
NEW YORK UNIV., N.Y., GRAD. SCH. OF SOCIAL WORK
REPORT NUMBER NY-CAP-66-9573-0-5433024-PT-2 PUB DATE APR 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.48 160P.

DESCRIPTORS- *NEGRO YOUTH, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, *JOB SEEKERS, SELF ESTEEM, YOUTH EMPLOYMENT, WORK ATTITUDES, WORK EXPERIENCE, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *JOB PLACEMENT, *EMPLOYMENT SERVICES, UNEMPLOYED, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, POVERTY PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY, NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS,

OF THE 601 YOUTHS WHOSE CHARACTERISTICS WERE STUDIED IN PHASE I (VT 004 090), 377 WERE NOT PLACED IN JOBS OR TRAINING WITHIN THREE MONTHS AFTER THEIR INITIAL INTERVIEW AT THE JOB CENTERS. OF THESE, 201 WERE INTERVIEWED DURING PHASE II TO DETERMINE THE TRAITS WHICH DISTINGUISHED THEM FROM OTHERS WHO HAD BEEN PLACED BY THE CENTERS, AND THE FACTORS IN BOTH THE CENTERS AND THE YOUTHS THAT WERE RELATED TO PLACEMENT. SOME OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS WERE (1) THE SAMPLE YOUTHS VIEWED THE PLACEMENT FUNCTION OF THE JOB CENTERS AS FAR MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE TRAINING AND REMEDIAL SERVICES, (2) THEY DID NOT DIFFER IN ANY MAJOR RESPECT FROM THE YOUTHS IN THE PHASE I STUDY, (3) THE CENTERS WERE MORE SUCCESSFUL IN PLACING THE YOUTHS INTERESTED IN TRAINING THAN THOSE WHO JUST WANTED JOBS, (4) THEY ASSIGNED TO JOBS OR TRAINING EITHER THE YOUTHS WHO WERE AROUND WHEN THE JOB ORDER WAS RECEIVED OR ONES WHO WERE AGGRESSIVE AND PERSONABLE FROM THE COUNSELOR'S VIEWPOINT, RATHER THAN ONES IN THE WAITING LIST FILES, AND (5) THE LACK OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THOSE PLACED BY THE CENTERS AND THOSE NOT PLACED, THOSE PLACED IN PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AND THOSE PLACED IN WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS, AND THOSE WHO DID AND WHO DID NOT FIND FULL-TIME JOBS SUGGESTED THAT NO SUBGROUP OF THE POPULATION STUDIES WAS MORE VOCATIONALLY IMPAIRED THAN ANOTHER, AND NO SUCH IMPAIRMENT WAS THE BASIS ON WHICH DECISIONS WERE MADE BY THE CENTERS. (ET)

ED015313

VT004091

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK • NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

4083

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

April, 1967

NY-CAP 66-9573
O-5433024

Supported by a grant from
the Office of Economic Opportunity

STUDY OF THE MEANING, EXPERIENCE, AND EFFECTS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ON NEGRO YOUTH WHO ARE SEEKING WORK

PART II

A Follow-up Study of Work-seeking Negro Young Men Who are Not Placed in Jobs by the Intake Centers

Project Directors

Melvin Herman
Stanley Sadofsky

Research Director

Joseph Bensman

Associate Research Directors

Robert Lilienfeld
Catherine Manos

New York University
Graduate School of Social Work
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

4684

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Phase 2 Highlights	i
	Introduction: The Background of this Report	xvi
I	Overview and Summary of the Findings	1
II	The Intake Centers and Their Follow-Up Procedures as Seen by the Respondents	29
III	Respondent Careers Since First Intake Interviews	60
IV	The Phase 1 Panel in Retrospect	85
	Appendix: Self-Image and Work Attitude Questions	133

4685

PHASE 2 HIGHLIGHTS

This study analyzes the responses of 201 Negro youths who, in a period of three months before the interviews, had applied for jobs and/or training at either the JOIN or HARYOU-Act job centers, but who had not been placed by these centers in the intervening time. The purpose of the study was to find differences between those respondents who were placed on job or training assignments by the centers, and those not placed, and to determine if possible, the factors in both the centers and the youths that are related to placement.

This is the second in a series of reports centered on the meaning, experience, and effects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on work-seeking Negro young men. Part I was a report on 601 job applicants who came in to two intake centers in New York City (the John F. Kennedy JOIN Center in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, and the HARYOU-Act Center on West 135th Street, in Central Harlem) between November of 1965 and July of 1966, in search of employment.

Succeeding parts of the study will focus on youths enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and will report on those youths who leave the Corps within a period of less than three months, as well as on those who stay in the Corps for longer than this time.

4686

The major results of the study are as follows:

(1) The youths in our sample viewed the job centers almost exclusively as placement agencies for jobs that were productive of income. Training, remedial services, and information were of minor importance. Not surprisingly, they were satisfied with the centers to the extent to which they could provide them with jobs, and were dissatisfied with the centers to the extent that they failed to find them jobs. They regarded their application at the centers primarily as job registration. The failure of the centers to get in touch with them (and 62 percent reported that the centers did not contact them after their initial application) was simply regarded by the youths as evidence that the centers did not have jobs available. Those not placed were under the illusion that they would be called by the centers as soon as jobs became available. As a result, they were not dissatisfied with the centers. Respondents were not much aware of other services by the centers, such as remediation classes (57 percent reported no knowledge of such services).

(2) The centers were only one means which youth use for securing jobs. Two-thirds of the youths who had not been placed by the centers had, in the three months interval, secured full-time jobs on their own. The median salary of those working on jobs

4687

they found was $57 per week. The average youth who had worked had held 1.3 jobs; the jobs were generally as service workers (laundries, car wash, etc.) or as laborers. In getting these jobs, two-thirds of the youths relied on friends and family rather than on formal systems of employment. (Thus, no formal job placement agency, including the centers, was indispensable for two-thirds of the youths.) There was a relatively high amount of turnover on these jobs (forty percent of those who had worked during the three month period already left their jobs; a few had had as many as three jobs during that time), and they did not regard the jobs as permanent (only 30 percent indicated any intention of remaining on their current jobs). If respondents regarded the jobs as satisfactory, they did so because they did not require much work (40 percent reported having very little to do). If they were unsatisfactory, it was because they did not pay well (49 percent). As a result, the jobs appeared to be not rewarding, neither with respect to the pay or the prospects of pay, nor with respect to the jobs themselves.

(3) Because of their focus on the centers as one of a number of job placement agencies, the youths were not particularly disturbed or concerned by the procedures, techniques, long waiting periods, etc., experienced at the centers. They were

4688

relatively satisfied with the centers in all respects other than the ability to place them on jobs (65 percent reported having a good opinion of the centers). Their families were also relatively satisfied with the centers. In addition, however, the centers did perform a function for a relatively small percentage of the youths in encouraging them to go back to school (14 percent had returned to school), but the centers lagged behind the youths' parents in their influences to return to school (one-third reported being influenced by center personnel, one-half by their families). As part of their functions, the centers did keep applicants informed to some extent of the availability of job-training programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the Police Academy Training Program, the MDTA Program, etc. The centers appear to do this, however, in terms of their job placement function rather than in terms of their information function. Thus, the numbers of respondents learning about the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, and other such programs appeared to correspond roughly to the number of jobs available. Thus, when asked if the centers had ever mentioned to them the following programs, the percentages replying yes were: Neighborhood Youth Corps, 25 percent; Job Corps, 62 percent; any others 22 percent; of these the Police Cadet Training Program was cited most frequently.

4689

(4) The youths in this report (youths not serviced by the center for any reason) were not different in any major respect from all those youth who applied for work or training at the centers (respondents in the Phase 1 Study).

(5) Those respondents who managed to secure jobs by themselves were not essentially different from those who did not, except for the following characteristics: respondents with lower levels of education, and younger respondents, ages 16 and 17, were less likely to secure for whatever reason employment than older and better educated respondents. However, those respondents who had gotten jobs had slightly (but not statistically significant) better work attitude scores than those who had not. Those who had gotten jobs on their own had improved slightly their self-esteem scores over their respective self-esteem scores, when the same test was administered three months earlier. Those who had not secured work showed less improvement in their scores. It thus appears that both work attitudes and self-esteem are related to either the desire or the ability to obtain jobs, even in so short a period as three months.

(6) The centers place youths in programs like the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other similar governmentally financed work and training programs. In addition, they serve

4690

to place youths in direct placements with employers. A special analysis of those respondents who were placed in the governmental programs and in "direct" (private) placements was undertaken in order to determine what operative characteristics in the placement process and in the attitudes and attributes of the youths resulted in placement. This was to determine how "creaming" and its opposite, "sedimentation," operated in the placement process. It is generally understood that the job centers seek to match youths in those jobs which require the most of their potential and offer the best rewards for them. One might therefore expect that those youths who have the most education, the best work attitudes, and the most self-esteem would be placed in regular employment. The overall results indicate that there are very few differences between those youths placed in private employment, in governmentally financed job and work training programs, and those not securing any job (or work assignments) at all. To the extent that there are differences, however, the enrollees with the highest self-esteem and the best work attitude scores tended to be placed in the government-financed job training programs. If this is true, then the process of "creaming" operates in a direction which is the reverse of that expected; with respect to direct placements, the process is "sedimentation." To the extent that our interviewers have been able to directly observe the placement process, it appears that the centers operate their employment processes primarily in terms of a shape-up system. Whenever a series of jobs or training assignments become available, those applicants who are most quick and aggressive, therefore having the greatest amount of self-esteem and motivation to get a job, and who have spent more time at the centers, are the ones who get the assignments. In attempting to meet the requirements of private industry, the centers select candidates who are older and who have somewhat better educational levels. Direct placement in private industry does not appear to use the same "shape-up" procedures. These become available through other devices, and do not require as much persistence and aggressiveness on the part of the applicant.

If this description encompasses the job placement procedures of the centers, then a number of other corollaries are suggested:

(a) The job centers do not use their files, and the background information available therein, in order to place "the right person in the right job."

(b) Rather, they attempt to fill the job immediately in terms of any candidate on hand who possesses the apparent minimum qualifications for the job. In a sense, this is understandable. First of all, it is often difficult to reach youths whose records may be on file but who may no longer be living at the addresses on file.

(c) In addition, the openings that are available tend to close up rapidly, and if an individual immediately available is not sent out to fill the vacancy, the vacancy may disappear. Thus, regardless of their best intentions, the centers are not able to carry out a consistent and rational placement policy.

(d) Moreover, the centers in their present structure are not all too frequently permitted to determine the qualifications necessary for filling the vacancies. The standards or the job qualifications are filed by potential employing agencies, and the most the centers can do is to process these qualifications in the speediest possible time with the applicants available at the moment.

(e) This situation is further compounded by the fact that centers such as JOIN and HARYOU-Act are official agencies for such programs as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, but they represent only one and a minor source of jobs for private employers. Thus,

4693

it appears that the centers do not have a wide range of non-governmental jobs available for placement, as evidenced by a relatively low placement rate. (Thus, this study indicates an overall placement rate in industry or working of just over one-third of all applicants (37 percent); of those placed, 57 percent were placed in private employment; this is 21 percent of all the applicants.)

(f) As a result, youths evidently do not expect the centers to be albe to provide a great deal of placement services, and so seek jobs elsewhere. It appears that for the centers to develop maximum effectiveness in fulfilling their functions of matching allocating youths to jobs in relationship to their motivation and qualifications of the youths, the centers must develop a wider range and a greater number of jobs. This would require major concentration on job development efforts, especially in relation to private employers. Once this is done, the centers would be able to assure youths that their applications could be meaningfully processed and that a job at a center would be more than the opportunity to get what amounts to a temporary job that provides immediate but short term income.

4594

(7) Although the centers are organized somewhat differently, and operate under somewhat different auspices, the results were virtually identical for both centers. This, however, may be more a function of the small sample size of 201 interviews, than of the absence of differences.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon these and other data provided in the body of the report, the conclusions of the study are as follows:

(1) The very large proportions of youth reporting that the centers never called them in again for counseling or testing after their first intake suggests that there are many more youths coming in to the centers than their staffs are able to process.

(2) The even larger proportion of youths reporting that they were never called in about a job or training assignment, as well as the observations made by our study staff in following up on applicants suggest that there is no organized filing system by which the waiting lists at the centers are used when jobs or training assignments become available.

It appears, instead, that for the most part, jobs are assigned to those who may be around at the time a notice comes in, with little if any use of waiting lists, except for those unusually

4695

aggressive and personable youths who are able to wait out the intake process and make some impression on the counselors. Except for these exceptional youths, the center staffs fail to maintain continuing communications with them.

(3) The centers appear to be more successful in placing those youths interested in training than those who just want jobs. They appear to focus more on serving existing programs than finding new jobs.

(4) Very few of the youths or their families appear hostile towards, or are opposed to the centers. But it also appear that comparatively few of the youths are interested in what the centers have to offer other than job referrals. If the applicant's family objects at all to his contact with the centers, it is usually on the basis of their preferring that he finish his schooling.

(5) It does not appear, either, that many of these youths have "dropped out" of contact with the centers; most of them are still waiting to hear from the centers about job openings.

(6) The respondents' job careers since intake (and before, as revealed in their intake interviews) show that most of those youths were able to find full-time jobs, at median salaries paying about $20 per week more than the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps stipend. But the high rate of job-leaving

4696

indicates that a central problem lies in their ability to find jobs on which they are willing or able to stay for any appreciable length of time, or jobs at which they are able to last.

(7) There is, therefore, a definite need for centers that offer sufficient job opportunities, but it is important that they be jobs different from those the youths can obtain on their own. Otherwise, the centers serve no function that any job agency cannot perform.

(8) The most striking conclusion is that the centers exercise little selection among applicants. The differences between those assigned to private employment and those sent to work-training programs were slight, with the exception of age. And furthermore, those differences in terms of work attitudes and self-esteem that did exist were in "the wrong direction," in that those assigned to work-training programs appeared slightly more serious and able than those sent to private industry.

Furthermore, the differences between those placed by the centers and those not placed by the centers were also too small to be statistically meaningful. Finally, those reporting that they had not been asked to return by the centers proved to be not significantly different with respect to work attitudes, age, or self-image, from those reporting that they had been asked to return.

Thus, by almost all observable traits, the centers failed to exert meaningful distinctions between youths at all points in their intake and assessment process.

(9) The lack of differences between those working and not working, between those placed by the centers and those not placed, between those placed in private employment and those in work-training programs, between those asked and not asked by the centers to return, and between those who did not find full-time jobs during the intervening three months and those who did, make it implausible to suggest that any one segment of these youths is significantly more vocationally impaired than any other or that such impairment is the basis on which decisions are made by the centers. Although there does appear to exist a wide range of vocational disability or impairment among the youths, these problems appear to cut across all categories available for analysis.

(10) That there is a positive need for centers which offer sufficient and rewarding job opportunities, as well as supportive services for these youths, is indicated by respondent careers both before intake, and during the three months afterwards; the applicants at intake reported a job history of considerable unemployment, and, when employed, of casual, short-term jobs. Although rapid turnover in employment is characteristic of youth in this age

4698

range, the problem is magnified for the Negro youth, to whom one meaningless job is very like another.

It cannot be said that a major part of these youths have, by themselves, found their way out of the self-perpetuating cycle of casual, aimless employment.

(11) Since there are few differences between youths assigned and not assigned by the centers, between those placed in private employment and in youth work programs, and between those asked and not asked to return by the centers, it would appear that the pattern or policy by which center personnel operate with respect to applicants except for the previously noted difference is almost completely "ad hoc," random and uncontrolled. The centers do not systematically and intentionally "cream" the best of the youth, but appear to operate on a "shape up" basis. If jobs for Negro youth remain scarce, and if the centers remain unable to develop and apply guidelines for evaluating and assigning applicants, it appears likely that placement by the centers will continue to be a random process, in spite of an "intake process" presumably designed to differentiate among applicants.

(12) The centers at present appear to serve primarily as input to pre-existent programs, and their intake procedures may be less concerned with meeting the needs of applicants, and more

4699

concerned with filling pre-existent quotas in youth programs, according to pre-determined standards. The centers, in order to serve their applicants, will have to develop better methods to evaluate the needs of the applicants, and develop more jobs suitable to those needs.

4700

INTRODUCTION

This is the second in a series of reports centered on the meaning, experience, and effects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on work-seeking Negro young men. Part I was a report on 601 youths who came to two intake centers in New York City (the John F. Kennedy JOIN Center in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn and the HARYOU-Act Center on West 135th Street in Central Harlem) in search of employment or work training between November 1965 and July 1966.

Forthcoming parts of the study will focus on those youths who enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and will report on those who leave the Corps within a period of less than three months as well as on those who stay in the Corps for three months or longer.

THE PHASE 2 REPORT

The present report is the result of following up on the 601 applicants who were interviewed by New York University as part of this study at the intake centers. Six week after each job applicant was interviewed, our interviewers stationed at the intake centers checked the center files to determine the applicant's current status. Those applicants who were not reported as having been successfully placed in full-time jobs or in work-training programs became the focus for a panel study, the principal purpose of which

4701

was to determine the distinguishing traits of those youths who, for one reason or another, had not been placed in full-time jobs or in work-training programs.*

The purpose of the Phase 2 Study, then, is: (1) to determine the characteristics of youths who drop out of contact with the centers at any point after reception but before assignment; (2) the reactions of the applicants to the intake centers and their processes; and (3) their subsequent careers after having lost contact with the intake centers.

---

* Center procedures are basically three-stage, consisting of (1) reception, (2) intake, and (3) assignment.

Reception. Upon applicant's first appearance at a center, customary face-sheet data are recorded (name, address, age, etc.); a brief orientation session is held (once or twice daily group meetings at JOIN; individual orientation at HARYOU-Act); then applicant is assigned to a counselor. If case load permits, counseling may take place the same day; more often, after applicant-counselor introduction, an appointment is arranged for a later date.

Intake. Consists of testing and evaluation, followed by counseling sessions, and is usually by appointment. After evaluation of test results, and of the respondent, counselor makes a decision -- sometimes in consultation with the youth -- concerning an appropriate assignment.

Assignment. Refers to applicant's placement either in full- or part-time employment or in a youth-work program (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, MDTA, On-the-Job Training, etc.).

4702

THE FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

Table 1 following indicates the derivation of the Phase 2 sample from the original group of applicants.

Of the 601 applicants interviewed at intake, the center records indicated that 72 percent (432) had not been placed in jobs or training assignments six weeks after their applications. The centers reported that 255 (59 percent) of these 432 youths had dropped out of contact with the centers, in that they had failed to respond to letters or telephone calls asking them to come in to the centers, or had failed to keep appointments with center counselors, and that 177 (41 percent) had not been placed, but were still in contact with the centers.

Letters were sent to these 432 youths, three months after their first intake interviews, asking them to come in to the offices of the Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth for a follow-up interview, to indicate what they had been doing since their intake interviews at the job centers.

It was decided not to invite the applicants to come in to the intake centers for their follow-up interviews, in case any critical or negative attitudes towards the centers that the respondents might have developed would depress the rate and the content of response.

Included with each letter were instructions on how to reach the Center offices, a subway token, and a dime for a telephone call to arrange for another interview if the youth could not appear at the suggested time. The youth was told he would be paid for the interview.* If the youth did not appear in response to this first letter, follow-up letters were sent out at regular intervals, and finally, a field interviewer attempted to find these non-respondents at their home addresses.

As a result of these procedures, interviews with 256 youths were obtained during the period from April through October, 1966. Of these 256 youths, 55 indicated during their interviews that they were working and had, in fact, been placed by the intake centers. But this information apparently had not reached the intake center files. These 55 interviews were subsequently deleted from the study, leaving a total of 201 youths interviewed for the Phase 2 Study.

Finally, the numbers of those placed and not placed by the centers were adjusted by these 55 respondents so that, of the original 601 applicants, 224 (or 37 percent) were classified as placed, and 377 (or 63 percent) were classified as not placed by the centers.

---

* Respondents were paid three dollars per interview in the early stages of the study; this produced a response rate of 33 percent. An experimental mailing offering five dollars per interview produced a substantial improvement in the response rate, to about 58 percent; as a result, respondents in the latter part of the study were paid five dollars. Field follow-ups brought in an additional 5 percent. The overall response rate for the entire study was 59.3 percent.

4704

Table 1

DERIVATION OF THE PHASE 2 SAMPLE

Interviewed at Intake (Phase 1)	601 = 100%	
	No.	%
Results of Follow-Ups		
Reported placed by centers	169	28.1
Reported by centers as not placed	432	71.9
Applicants Reported as Not Placed	432 = 100%	
Reported as dropped out of contact	255	59.0
Reported as still in contact with center	177	41.0
Respondents Receiving Letters	432 = 100%	
Phase 2 interviews	256	59.3
Deleted interviews	55	
The Phase 2 sample	201	
Adjusted Totals		
Interviewed at intake	601 = 100%	
Placed by centers	224	37.3
Not placed by centers	377	62.7

PLAN OF THE REPORT

1. Phase 2 Highlights. This presents the principal findings of the Report in summary form.

2. Overview and Summary. Chapter 1 will present an overview of the Report, which is developed in greater detail in the chapters that follow.

4705

3. The Job Centers and the Intake Process as Seen by the Respondents. Chapter 2 will discuss the intake centers and their follow-up procedures as seen by the respondents. Subjects include the types of jobs offered, the jobs refused by the respondents, the number of follow-up calls and letters from the centers, center classes in remedial arithmetic and reading, the centers' recruiting for such youth programs as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the MDTA, etc. Also reported: respondents' attitudes toward the centers, including their reasons for not responding to the centers' notification of job availabilities; family influences on respondent reactions to the centers; and the youths' stated intentions of returning to the centers in the future.

4. Respondent Careers Since Their First Interview. Chapter 3 will examine the work careers of these youths subsequent to their first intake interviews, and will report on those who have found full-time employment on their own, those who have returned to full-time school, and those who remain unemployed. The youths will be compared according to norms developed in the Phase 1 Report, which include such variables as age, levels of schooling, and attitudes towards work and towards themselves (including measures of self-esteem which have appeared, on the basis of data developed in the Phase 1 study, to be related to the ability of these young persons to find and hold jobs).

4706

5. The Phase 1 Panel in Retrospect. Chapter 4 will examine the original panel of 601 youths in the light of what has happened since their intake interview. Three major categories will be established: (a) those placed in jobs or in work-training programs by the centers, (b) those not placed but who were Phase 2 respondents, and (c) those not placed and who did not respond to letters asking them to come in for Phase 2 interviews. The purpose of this comparison is to determine what distinguishing characteristics, if any, are associated with each of these three outcomes, especially such traits as low self-esteem or poor work-attitude scores, and various demographic traits.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Needless to say, a work of this administrative and technical complexity cannot be completed without the aid and cooperation of vast numbers of individuals who go far beyond their occupational requirements to make the study possible. This study, in its present form, would not have been possible without the aid, encouragement, cooperation and assistance of the following persons:

Professor Abraham Alcabes, Columbia University
Dr. Frank Arricale, New York City Youth Board
Mark Battle, Neighborhood Youth Corps, U.S. Department of Labor
Abraham Becker, Community Council of New York
Col. Howard F. Bogner, Fordham University
Nicholas Dubner, HARYOU-Act
Howard Fields, HARYOU-Act

4707

Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, Fordham University
David Jones, JOIN
Dr. James Jones, New York University
Richard Kelly, Willoughby House
Judge Mary Conway Kohler, New York City Anti-Poverty
  Operations Board
W. E. R. LaFarge, JOIN
William Lawrence, Office of Economic Opportunity
Howard Luckett, HARYOU-Act
Dr. Lester Luntz, JOIN
Dr. Elizabeth Lyman, Community Service Society
Professor Sophia MacDowell, Howard University
Dr. John Martin, Fordham University
Dr. Fred Mayrand, JOIN
Michael McMahon, Office of Economic Opportunity
Dr. Robert Palmer, JOIN
Dr. Herman Piven, New York University
Dean Alex Rosen, New York University
Dr. Morris Rosenberg, National Institute of
  Mental Health
Henry Rosner, New York City Department of Personnel
Hyman Russo, New York City Department of Personnel
Robert Schrank, Mobilization for Youth
Dr. Edward Silverberg, New York City Department
  of Personnel
Dr. Gerald M. Shattuck, Fordham University
Dr. N.P. Tillman, Howard University
Richard Unger, New York City Department of Personnel

4708

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

This chapter is designed to present, in summary form, an overview of the principal findings of the Phase 2 Study. More detailed analysis appears in the chapters that follow.

BACKGROUND OF THIS REPORT

The respondents of this report are a subset of those studied earlier, in the Phase 1 Report. The previous report was a study of all youths applying for placement at two intake centers. This report studies those who of that original group were not successfully placed by the centers, either in "direct placements," i.e., in full-time jobs in the private sector, or in such work-training programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, etc. This Phase 2 Report was originally designed to focus upon those youth who drop out of the intake process, and, in the process, to determine something of the traits of those youth who appear to be unable or unwilling to engage themselves in programs designed for them.

But our follow-up procedures to determine whether the applicants had been placed in private employment or in training programs produced data which suggested a change of plans. Follow-ups six weeks after each intake interview indicated that the centers had placed only about 28 percent of the applicants; and due to the unsystematic state of files at the intake centers, it proved impossible to obtain reliable information concerning the remaining 72 percent. As a consequence, it was decided to interview all of those non-placed applicants. Respondents, therefore, include both "drop-outs" and applicants who, after three months, had not yet been placed by the centers.

THE INTAKE CENTERS AS SEEN BY THE RESPONDENTS

Center Follow-up Procedures

Sixty-two percent (almost two-thirds) of the Phase 2 respondents reported that they had not heard from the centers during the three-month period between their intake interviews at the centers, and the Phase 2 interview. Of those who had heard from the centers, and had been asked to return, 28 percent had been asked to return within a week and 53 percent within a month of their first appearance at the centers.

Youths Returning to the Centers as a Result of Center Follow-up

Of those youths who had heard from the centers (38 percent of the respondents), about three-fourths (73 percent) reported that they had gone to the centers in response. For the most part, they were called in for testing or counseling.

Youths Returning to the Centers on Their Own Initiative

Thirty-six percent of the respondents reported that they had returned to the centers without waiting to be called back, and 64 percent indicated that they had not gone back to the centers on their own initiative. Seventeen percent of those who did return on their own reported that they had returned once, and another 12 percent that they had gone back two or three times; almost half (44 percent) returned within the first month after their intake interviews. When asked why they had gone back, about three-fourths (73 percent) answered, "to look for a job"; few mentioned testing and counseling (3 percent and 4 percent, respectively, of those who had gone back).

Job Opportunities Offered by the Centers

More than three-fourths (78 percent) of the respondents reported that the centers had never offered them any jobs or placements at intake, nor ever written them to come in for jobs subsequent to intake. Of those respondents who did hear from the centers, 84 percent reported that they went in to see about the jobs; of those who went in, 29 percent reported that they refused the jobs

4711

because the pay was too low (the median weekly wage of jobs refused was $49), 23 percent got the jobs, 18 percent did not follow up on the jobs, and the rest did not get the jobs. Of those respondents who were called in for a job, one-third heard from the centers within a month after their intake interviews.

Respondents' Opinions of the Centers

Sixty-five percent of the respondents reported that they had a good opinion of the centers, the rest had "not such a good opinion." The principal reasons given for both responses were related to job placement: for the first, "they help people find jobs"; for the second, "they were too slow in finding jobs." Eighty-four percent of the respondents reported that the people at the centers seemed to know what they were doing. When asked if there were any procedures at the centers which appeared unnecessary or a waste of time, 20 percent replied that there were. The principal references were: "you have to wait hours," "they ask too many useless questions," and "the tests." But it does not appear that center procedures are too onerous for a majority of the respondents.

Respondents appear to object more to the types of jobs offered them by the centers, than to center procedures or requirements. When asked if there were any things the centers wanted them to do that they didn't like or want to do, 20 percent answered yes. Among this group, the principal things objected to were: "join the Job Corps," or to take other jobs that the respondents did not like.

When asked if there was anything about the way in which things were done at the centers that made them not want to go back, two-thirds replied no, and one-third of the respondents answered yes, indicating, as the principal factors: "it took too long to get me a job," "you sit there for hours waiting," and "you had to keep coming back."

In response to the question: "Are there any things you wanted the center to do for you that they didn't do", 62 percent answered "yes". When asked what these things were, more than 80 percent of the responses came under the heading of "find me a (better or permanent) job"; about 20 percent of the responses referred to training as something wanted but not supplied by the centers.

The overall impression given by the respondents is that of a lukewarm attitude towards the centers; they neither liked nor disliked them very much, nor did they appear to expect very much from them. They appear to conceive of the centers only as job referral agencies and have no feeling that the centers have established any meaningful, continuous relationship with them.

Respondents' Intentions in Coming to the Centers

In response to the question, "When you went to the center, were you really looking for a job, or did you just want to see what they had to offer?", 84 percent replied that they were really looking for jobs, 9 percent said that they just wanted to see what the centers had to offer, and 7 percent replied "both." About half of those who were looking for jobs had specific jobs in mind, mostly in the category of skilled worker, or in clerical jobs.

Center Recruitment for Job and Training Programs

When asked if anyone at the intake centers had mentioned the Neighborhood Youth Corps to them, 25 percent replied "yes"; 62 percent replied yes when asked the same question with reference to the Job Corps, and 22 percent indicated having heard about programs other than these, of which the Police Cadet Training Program was first in frequency of mention.

Centers' Roles in Decision to Return to School

Fourteen percent of the respondents had returned to school since their first interview, 7 percent full time and 6 percent part time. About one-third of those who had returned to school indicated that they had been influenced in this decision by personnel at the centers, and about one-half by their families. It appears, then, that pressures to return to school came from both the centers and the respondents' families.

4714

Respondents' Knowledge of Remediation Services

Respondents not working full-time were asked if the centers had classes in reading and mathematics. More than half (53 percent) did not know, 43 percent said yes, 4 percent said no. Of those who knew of the reading and math classes, 73 percent said they would attend them if the centers asked them to.*

Respondents' Use of Other Centers

Twenty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they had gone to other centers in the city since their first interviews. Of these respondents about one-third indicated that they were currently in active contact with counselors at other centers. Only one respondent reported attending classes in reading and arithmetic at another center. These other centers visited by the respondents included other neighborhood offices of JOIN and HARYOU, the Urban League, Youth in Action, Mobilization for Youth, etc.

Respondents' Intentions to Return to JOIN or HARYOU-Act if Asked to Come In

Eighty-five percent of the respondents said they would go in if the centers sent them any more job notices, 14 percent said they ould not. When these latter were asked why they would not, the espondents either expressed poor opinions of the centers or ndicated that they had made use of other alternatives available to hem, such as private job agencies, joining the Armed Services, etc.

---

* At the time of this study, center efforts in remediation services were directed primarily towards youth currently enrolled in work programs, rather than towards applicants. Since this time, remediation programs for applicants have been instituted.

espondents' Knowledge of the Neighborhood Youth Corps

Two-thirds of the respondents reported that they had heard of he Neighborhood Youth Corps prior to its mention in the Phase 2 nterview. Asked what they had heard of it, the most frequent esponse was that it was a job (39 percent); the next most frequent esponse was that it was "job training" (27 percent).

Seventy-five percent of those who had heard of the Corps said hey thought joining it was a good idea, 11 percent thought it was ot such a good idea, and 14 percent did not know. Of those who had eard of the Corps, 39 percent reported that friends of their had oined the Corps. It may be that these friends were an influence n the favorable responses among the respondents.

ummary

The respondents seem to indicate that they have not "dropped ut" of contact with the centers; rather, they are, for the most art, still "waiting to hear." They do not indicate that the center rocedures are exceptionally onerous, nor that they have been driven ff by those procedures. In spite of the inactivity from their

4716

point of view of the centers, their opinions of the centers remain for the most part favorable. This may simply mean that the respondents have a realistic picture of job opportunities generally available and do not blame the centers for not having non-existent jobs. On the other hand, the respondents appear to have little awareness of center services other than job referral, and little or no interest in them. With more than half the respondents reporting that they did not know whether or not the centers offer classes in reading and arithmetic, it does not appear that center efforts in these areas are very strong. Nor does it appear that the centers have made any significant efforts to keep in contact with these youths.

RESPONDENT JOB ACTIVITIES SINCE FIRST INTAKE INTERVIEWS

Respondent Status at the Time of the Phase 2 Interviews

Three months after the intake interviews, 40 percent of the Phase 2 respondents were employed in full-time jobs that they had obtained themselves, 14 percent had returned to school, 4 percent were working part-time, and 44 percent were unemployed. (This includes 2 percent who were both working and going to school.)

4717

Job Histories Since Intake

During the three-month interim between intake interviews and Phase 2 interviews, two-thirds of the respondents had had at least one full-time job; one-third had had no jobs; 16 percent had had more than one full-time job. And, as noted, at time of Phase 2 interview, 40 percent of respondents had full-time jobs. Together, these facts would indicate both a high rate of job turnover and a highly unstable rate of employment. They would also seem to suggest that while the respondents, or at least two-thirds of them, had been successful in finding full-time jobs, they nevertheless experienced real difficulty in being able to find jobs which lasted or on which they wished or were able to stay.

So far as part-time work is concerned, 81 percent of the respondents reported that they had had no part-time jobs since their intake interviews, 19 percent had had one or more part-time jobs; only 4 percent were working part-time at the time of their Phase 2 interviews.

Respondents Working Full-time

Respondents who were working full-time at the time of their Phase 2 interviews were employed for the most part as service workers, laborers, office workers, and operatives (86 percent). They were engaged primarily by manufacturers, service establishments, offices, and retail outlets (75 percent). Median weekly wage was $57. Most of these jobs had come through friends or relatives (53 percent); the State Employment Service was a source for 15 percent of the jobs; intake centers in New York City other than the two used for this study were a source for 9 percent; private employment agencies were a source for 6 percent, and "just walking in and asking for a job" had accounted for 8 percent. This reiterates the Phase 1 pattern; respondents do not tend to use the more formal, public channels of employment.

Two-thirds of those working reported that they liked their current jobs, 30 percent disliked them, the rest replied "don't know." The reasons most frequently given for liking their jobs were: type of work (33 percent), easy work (31 percent), the people (19 percent), and "getting paid" (15 percent). Among those who disliked their jobs, the reasons most frequently given were: low pay (57 percent), the work (39 percent), and the boss (17 percent).

When asked what things were liked about their present jobs, respondents mentioned as the three principal factors: the people (33 percent), the type of work (33 percent), the fact that the work was easy (25 percent). High pay was not mentioned. When asked what things were disliked, 36 percent answered that they had no dislikes. Twenty-five percent mentioned low pay, and 19 percent replied, "the work."

If respondents regarded the jobs as satisfactory, they did so because they did not require much work (40 percent having very little to do). If they were unsatisfactory, it was because they did not pay well (49 percent). As a result, the jobs appeared to be not rewarding, neither with respect to the pay or the prospects of pay, nor with respect to the jobs themselves.

Respondents appear to judge jobs in part by their bearing upon the future. Asked if they had learned anything on their jobs, and if so, whether these things were worth learning, seventy percent of the respondents said they had learned things; of these 80 percent said the things they had learned were worth learning, the principal reason being they were "good experience for the future." Those who had found the things they had learned not worth learning also stressed the future, saying that the things learned would be of no help on future jobs.

Seventy percent of those working said they regarded their jobs as "temporary"; 30 percent regarded them as "permanent." The primary reason given for regarding the jobs as temporary was that this was not the kind of work wanted for a career; the principal reason given for regarding the job as permanent was that there were chances for promotion if one stayed.

Several conclusions are suggested by the data given above. First, it appears that while two-thirds of the respondents succeeded

4720

in finding full-time jobs on their own, the number of jobs already left during the three-month period indicates that a major difficulty is being able to find jobs that last or that they want to or are able to keep. Secondly, the jobs held do not offer a very satisfactory picture. Many of them appear to be lower paid, marginal jobs with little prospect for the future. Furthermore, if the jobs held at the time of the interview are hypothetically assumed to be better than those already left during the three-month interim period, then the total picture might be even bleaker. In regard to job turnover, however, it should be remarked that a considerable but unknown amount may be due as much to vocational or psychological disabilities in the youths as to the nature of the jobs they have obtained. Thirdly, it cannot be concluded that the greater part of these youths have moved towards a solution of their career problems during the three months after intake. Almost half were still unemployed, only 14 percent had returned to school, and the 40 percent working full time were employed for the most part in what seemed to be marginal jobs.

Respondents Not Working

Respondents working full-time at the time of their Phase 2 interview were compared with respondents not working, with respect to the following characteristics:

(1) Level of Schooling. Respondents with lower levels of

4721

education were either less successful in obtaining employment or less active in seeking it: those who had completed 9th grade or less accounted for 19 percent of those working, but 31 percent of those not working; those who had completed 11th grade or higher accounted for 53 percent of those working, but 41 percent of those not working.

(2) *Age*. Sixteen and 17-year olds accounted for 25 percent of those working, and 44 percent of those not working; those 18 years or older were 75 percent of those working, 56 percent of those not working. (Age and schooling completed are, of course, related variables.)

(3) *Work Attitudes*.* Various items in the questionnaire (described in Chapter IV) served to measure the respondents' degree of commitment to work. On one of these six individual items, those working appeared to have significantly more favorable attitudes toward work than those not working (see Chapter III for details); but on the remaining five items, those working scored only slightly higher than those not working with the one exception noted. The differences were not statistically significant; however, if the number of respondents had been larger, the results would register as statistically significant.

When the individual work attitude questions were scored to form a scale, those working full time were found to be slightly higher in work-attitude scores than those not working (e.g., those with below average work-attitude scores comprised only 3 percent of those working, but 8 percent of those not working). The differences, however, were not marked.

---

* See Appendix, p. 134.

The work-attitude scores of the respondents developed from their intake interviews differed very little from the scores of the same respondents taken at their Phase 2 interviews.

(4) Self-Image Scores.* The Rosenberg self-image scale** was administered to all Phase 2 respondents; this was a replication of the same scale for the same persons, when seen at their intake interviews.

There did not appear to be any great changes in self-image scores for the sample taken as a whole. Among those respondents who were working full time at the time of their Phase 2 interviews, 63 percent showed a self-image score higher than their scores at intake; among those not working, 56 percent showed scores higher than their intake scores.

Those with below-average self-image scores at the time of intake accounted for 21 percent of those working Phase 2 respondents, and 25 percent of those not working.

---

* See Appendix, p. 133.

** Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, Princeton, 1965.

It would appear from this that working full time has had some slight impact in the direction of improved self-image scores; but the difference is not large.

RESPONDENTS WITH NO JOB EXPERIENCE DURING THE THREE-MONTH INTERIM

In addition to the analysis described above, comparing those working at the time of their Phase 2 interviews with those not working, a parallel analysis was run comparing those who had had no full-time jobs at all during the three months between their Phase 1 and Phase 2 interviews and those who had had at least one full-time job.

Almost identical results were obtained. At the time of the Phase 2 interview those who had had no jobs scored slightly lower both on self-image, and on overall work attitude, but the differences were too small to be taken as meaningful. On some individual work-attitude questions, however, those who had had no jobs appeared to have a slightly more favorable attitude toward work than those who had.

The only significant finding in this part of the analysis is that 16- and 17-year olds accounted for 54 percent of all those who had had no jobs, but only 27 percent of all those who had. Thus, if age is the only significant factor in this group, it would appear that failure to find (or seek) employment may be as much a function of employer reluctance to hire 16- and 17-year olds, as it is of any lack of motivation on the part of the youths themselves.

In any event, except for age, there were no clear-cut differences between those who did and did not have full-time jobs during the three months between interviews.

THE PHASE 1 PANEL IN RETROSPECT

In this portion of the study, the original panel of 601 respondents were examined with respect to the disposition of their applications for work.

Type of Placement: Direct Placements vs. Youth-Work Programs

As indicated earlier, the centers had placed 224 of the original 601 applicants. Information was available regarding the type of placement made for 146.

Fifty-seven percent (83) of the placements were "direct placements," i.e., regular jobs in the private sector; 43 percent (63) were in youth work programs, as follows: Job Corps, 30 percent (or 43); JOIN Special Training, 7 percent (10); Neighborhood Youth Corps, 5 percent (7); and the M.D.T.A. program, 2 percent (3).

Though the differences were slight, those placed in work-training programs had somewhat higher work-attitude scores than those placed in private employment, and more of them reported that they worried about their future. This is the reverse of what would be expected, i.e., one would expect that the youths more able and more motivated would be placed in private industry, and that youths exhibiting problems in motivation and attitude would be placed in work-training programs.

There were no differences between these groups with respect to applicants who had had previous training for a trade.

The only clear-cut difference between direct placements and work-training assignees seemed to be that of age: the centers assigned more of the younger applicants to work-training programs, fewer to private employment.

It appears that the centers made no distinctions between applicants assigned to youth-work programs and those assigned to private employment.

Those Placed on Jobs or Training Assignments vs. Those Not Placed

Not only were there few differences between those placed in private employment and those placed in youth-work programs, there seemed to be very little difference between those placed by the centers and those not placed, and on the whole, the resemblances outweighed the differences.

At the same time, however, it should be noted that those placed by the centers did differ slightly from those not placed in the following traits:

Reason for Coming to the Centers. The centers placed 50 percent of those who came to the centers primarily for training, 38 percent of those who said they wanted both training and jobs, and 28 percent of those who wanted jobs.

Self-Image Scores. Those with high self-image scores were somewhat more likely to have been placed by the centers than those with low scores: the centers placed 29 percent of those with below average scores, but 40 percent and 39 percent, respectively, of those with average and above-average scores.

Work-Attitude Scores. The centers placed those with both below- and above-average work-attitude scores more frequently than those with average scores, placing 39 percent of the below-average applicants, 42 percent of those with above-average work-attitude scores, and 33 percent of those with average scores.

Checks on four of the six work-attitude items indicated that youths placed by the centers were slightly more work-oriented than those not placed (e.g., the statement "You don't have to work at a job you don't like; you can always go on relief," produced 34 percent agreement among those placed, compared with 39 percent agreement among those not placed). The differences, though not marked, would appear consistent with the hypothesis that those placed were slightly more work-oriented.

Apart from the slight differences reported above, the appliants placed on assignments by the centers resembled those not laced more than they differed, when examined with respect to the ollowing characteristics: age; level of schooling; previous job xperience; family and peer group attitudes towards the centers; pplicants reporting that their unemployment is a problem to their amilies; applicants reporting that someone "gives them a hard time" ecause they are not working; applicants who worry about not working; pplicants aspiring to live in better neighborhoods; differing levels f economic aspirations among the respondents; median earned family ncomes; time out of work; the two intake centers.

The conclusion suggested is that failure to be placed by the enters is not primarily related to the youths themselves, nor to ny of their characteristics, but, rather, that it appears to be rimarily a random process, relating more to the fluctuating numbers f jobs or work-training assignments available at any given time.

The centers appear to be working within a set of conditions that illify any efforts to exert meaningful distinctions among the plicants (see Conclusions, p. 22).

espondents Asked and Not Asked to Return by the Centers

Respondents who reported that they were asked to return to the enters were compared with those who indicated that they had not

4728

heard from the centers after their intake interviews. Those asked to return by the centers had slightly higher work-attitude scores, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Those not asked to return had slightly higher self-image scores; but again, the difference was too small to be statistically significant.

With respect to age, subsequent job experience, and miscellaneous attitude items, no meaningful differences could be found.

Respondents and Non-respondents

As noted earlier, those who were not placed on any kind of job or training assignment by the centers within six weeks after their intake interviews were requested by N.Y.U. to come in for interviews. A combination of letters, telephone calls, and field visits by interviewers produced, among the 377 not placed, 201 respondents and 176 who did not come in for interviewing. These two groups were also compared, in order to determine whether differences between the two groups might have produced any biases in the data.

Again, resemblances far outweighed the differences. There were no significant differences between respondents and non-respondents according to the following: reasons for coming to the centers (jobs, training, or both wanted); self-image scores; work attitudes; all other attitudinal questions; all other background information, including job experience, and median family incomes.

4729

There were statistically significant differences only according to two factors: (1) age: younger applicants were more apt to come in for Phase 2 interviewing than older ones (16- and 17-year olds accounted for 40 percent of the respondents in Phase 2, 32 percent of the non-respondents; 20- and 21-year olds accounted for 19 percent and 24 percent, respectively). (2) family structure: those applicants living alone or with friends only, or in families without their real or foster parents were less apt to come in than those living with one or more real or foster parent. But the differences were not large.

Since the data of Phase 1 indicated that age and family structure were not in themselves major variables affecting placement, it does not appear that non-response has introduced any noteworthy bias into the Phase 2 material.

CONCLUSIONS

The following points are suggested by the data of the study:

1. The very large proportions of youth reporting that the centers never called them in again for counseling or testing after their first intake suggests that there are many more youths coming in to the centers than their staffs are able or willing to process.

2. The even larger proportion of youths reporting that they were never called in about a job or training assignment, as well as the observations made by our study staff in following up on

4730

applicants suggest that there is no organized filing system by which the waiting lists at the centers are used where jobs or training assignments become available.

It appears, instead, that for the most part, jobs are assigned to whomever is around at the time a notice comes in, and who possesses the apparent minimum qualifications for the job, without use of waiting lists, except for those unusually aggressive and personable youths who are able to wait out the intake process and make some impression on the counselors. Except for these exceptional youths, the center staffs seem to exhibit no continuity of interest in the applicants, and to a large extent fail to maintain communications with them. This is understandable, for several reasons. First, it is often difficult to reach youths whose records may be on file but who may no longer be living at the addresses on file. Secondly, the openings that are available tend to close up rapidly, and if an individual immediately available is not sent out to fill the vacancy the vacancy may disappear. Thus, regardless of their intentions, the centers are not able to carry out a rational or consistent placement policy.

3. The centers appear to be more successful in placing those youths interested in training than those who just want jobs. They appear to be designed more to serve existing programs than to find new jobs.

4731

4. Very few of the youths or their families appear hostile towards, or are opposed to the centers. But it also appears that comparatively few of the youths are interested in what the centers have to offer other than job referrals. If the applicant's family objects at all to his contact with the centers, it is usually on the basis of their preferring that he finish his schooling.

5. The respondents' job careers both before intake (as revealed in their intake interviews) and after, show that most of those youths were able to find full-time jobs, at median salaries paying about $20 per week more than the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps stipend. But as noted earlier, the high rate of job-leaving indicates that the problem is in their being able to find jobs on which they are able or willing to stay for any appreciable length of time, or where the jobs last.

6. There is, therefore, a definite need for centers that offer sufficient job opportunities, but it is important that they not be jobs of the same types as the youths can obtain on their own. Otherwise, the centers serve no function that any job agency cannot perform.

7. The most striking conclusion is that the centers fail to exercise any selection whatsoever among the applicants. The differences between those assigned to private employment and those sent to work-training programs were, with the exception of age, too

4732

slight to be important. And furthermore, they were in the wrong direction, in that those assigned to work-training programs appeared slightly more serious and able than those sent to private industry.

Furthermore, the differences between those placed by the centers and those not placed by the centers were also too slight to be meaningful. Finally, those reporting that they had not been asked to return by the centers proved to be not significantly different with respect to work attitudes, age, or self-image from those reporting that they had been asked to return.

Thus, judging by these observations, the centers failed to make meaningful selections between youths at all points in the intake and evaluation process.

8. The lack of significant differences between those working and not working, between those placed by the centers and those not placed, between those placed in private employment and those placed in work-training programs, between those asked and not asked by the centers to return, and between those who did not find full-time jobs during the intervening three months and those who did, make it implausible to suggest that any one segment of these youths is greatly more impaired than any other, and that such impairment is the basis on which decisions are made by the centers. Although there does appear to exist a wide range of vocational disability or impairment among the youths, these problems appear to cut across all categories available for analysis.

4733

9. It does not appear, either, that many of these youths have "dropped out" of contact with the centers; indeed, most of them are still waiting to hear from the centers about jobs, three months later.

10. That there is a positive need for centers which offer sufficient and meaningful job opportunities, as well as supportive services for these youths, is indicated by respondent careers both before intake and during the three months following: at intake the applicants reported a job history of considerable unemployment and, when employed, of casual, short-term jobs. During the three months following intake, two-thirds of the respondents had had full-time jobs, but at the time of the Phase 2 interviews 40 percent of these were no longer employed, indicating a very high turnover and unstable rate of employment. Although rapid turnover in employment is characteristic of youth in this age range, the problem is magnified for the Negro youth, to whom one meaningless job is very like another. It appears that these youths continue to regard their employment as a sequence of temporary jobs that provide immediate but short-term income.

It cannot be said that a major part of these youths have found their way out of the self-perpetuating cycle of casual, dead-end employment.

11. Since there are few differences between youths placed and those not placed by the centers, between those placed in private

4734

employment and those placed in youth work programs, and between those asked and those not asked to return by the centers, it would appear that the pattern or policy by which center personnel operates with respect to applicants, except for the previously noted differences, is almost completely "ad hoc," or random. The centers do not "cream" the best of the youth, but, rather appear to operate on a "shape up" basis.

But it is precisely in this type of situation, where there is both a scarcity of jobs, and a fairly wide range of capability among the applicants, that one would expect some pattern of selection emerge. The most plausible pattern would be that of placing the more capable youths in regular jobs in the private sector, and the more disadvantaged applicants into work-training programs. However, this expected pattern fails to emerge.

The reasons why it fails to emerge are fairly clear. As noted before, the job openings tend to be filled very quickly, and the applicants are often dificult to reach quickly at the address on file at the centers. If someone immediately available is not sent out for the job, the vacancy is likely to disappear. Moreover, the centers are all too frequently not permitted to determine the qualifications necessary for filling the vacancies. The job qualifications are filled by the potential employers, and the most the centers can do is process these formal qualifications in the speediest possible time with the applicants available at the moment.

If the jobs for Negro youth remain scarce, and if the centers do not develop and apply guidelines for evaluating and assigning applicants, and do not make major efforts in job development among private employers, it appears likely that placement by the centers will continue to be a random process, in spite of an "intake process" presumably designed to differentiate between applicants.

12. The centers at present appear to serve only as input to pre-existent programs, and their intake procedures may be less concerned with meeting the needs of applicants, than with filling pre-existent quotas in youth programs, according to pre-determined standards. The centers, in order to serve their applicants, will have to develop both methods of evaluating the needs of the applicants and jobs suitable for meeting those needs, and, finally, must maintain some continuity of relationship with their applicants.

13. Although the centers used for this study were organized differently, and operated under different auspices, results were in general not significantly different. This, however, may be a function of the sample size of 201 respondents rather than a lack of any differences.

4736

Chapter II

THE INTAKE CENTERS AND THEIR FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES AS SEEN BY THE RESPONDENTS

CENTER FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

Respondents were asked if anyone at HARYOU-Act or at JOIN had ever written to them or asked them to come in after their first intake interviews at the centers. Sixty-two percent of the respondents reported that they had not been asked to come back, and 37 percent reported that they had. More JOIN than HARYOU respondents reported that they were asked to return, but the difference was small.*

Table 2

CENTER FOLLOW-UPS ON RESPONDENTS (1)

"Has anyone at (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) ever written or asked you to go back there?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	36.8
No	61.7
No answer	1.5

Of those who had been asked to come back, almost half reported that they had been asked to go back once (49 percent), and 70 percent reported that they had been called back once or twice.

*(Differences between HARYOU-Act and JOIN will be shown in the tables only where they are meaningful.)

4737

Table 3

CENTER FOLLOW-UPS ON RESPONDENTS (2)

"How many times were you asked to go back?"

Total	201
Not asked to call back	127
Asked to go back	74

Number of Times	Total 74=100%
One	48.6
Two	21.6
Three	14.9
Four	9.5
SUBTOTAL	
Up to four times	94.6
Five times and more	5.4
Don't know/no answer	---

The respondents' replies indicate that 28 percent were asked to come in within a week of their intake interviews, 53 percent had heard within a month, another 18 percent reported waiting one to three months; 30 percent did not remember the time elapsed between intake and the first follow-up by the centers. Fifty-seven percent of the JOIN respondents who were called back were called within a month, compared with 40 percent of the HARYOU-Act respondents.

4738

Table 4

TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN INTAKE INTERVIEW AND FIRST FOLLOW-UP

Elapsed Time	Total 74=100%
Same day	----
Next day, 1-3 days	10.8
Four-five days	10.8
Six, seven days (1 week)	6.8
SUBTOTAL - Up to one week	28.4
One to two weeks	12.2
Two to three weeks	1.4
Three to four weeks (1 month)	10.8
SUBTOTAL -	24.3
Four to six weeks	2.7
Six to eight weeks (2 months)	4.1
Eight to twelve weeks (3 months)	10.8
SUBTOTAL - 1 to 3 months	17.6
Don't remember	29.7

Most (74 percent) of the respondents indicated that the title of the person making the follow-up was that of counselor or social worker; another 8 percent said "receptionist" (these had not yet seen a counselor).

The method of center follow-up most commonly mentioned was by letter (35 percent); the next most frequent, the respondent had been asked on a previous visit to return (16 percent); telephone, (10 percent) personal visits made by agency personnel, (5 percent).

4739

Table 5

TITLE OF PERSON MAKING FIRST FOLLOW-UP FOR INTAKE CENTER

Title	Total 74=100%
Counselor, social worker	74.3
Receptionist	8.1
Miscellaneous	1.4
Don't know/ no answer	13.5
No answer	2.7

Table 6

AGENCY METHOD OF REACHING RESPONDENTS

Method of Contact	Total 74=100%
Letter	35.1
Was asked to return (on previous visit)	16.2
Telephone	9.5
Personal visit	5.4
Miscellaneous	1.4
No answer	32.4

4

YOUTH RESPONSES TO FIRST FOLLOW-UP

Seventy-three percent of the respondents who had been asked to return to the centers reported that they did so. The most frequently given reason for going in was for testing in reading level and arithmetic (41 percent), but this was mentioned only by the JOIN, not the HARYOU-Act, respondents; otherwise, the reason most often mentioned was "to look for a job" (35 percent).

Table 7A

YOUTHS RESPONSES TO FIRST FOLLOW-UP: REASONS

Did you go in?	Total 74-100%
Yes	73.0
No	27.0

Table 7B

WHAT DID YOU GO IN FOR?

Reason for Going	Total* 54=100%
Testing	40.7 **
To look for a job	35.2
Counseling (results of testing)	7.4
To talk of job training, job corps, police academy	5.6
Don't know/ no answer	13.0

---

*Multiple responses exceed 100 percent
** JOIN respondents only.

4741

The Youths who indicated that they had not gone to the center in response to the follow-up asked why. The answer most often given was that they were already working, but this represents only 8 of the 20 respondents who did not go in, a total too small for analysis. But in any event dissatisfaction in the center does not appear to be a major factor among the respondents.

YOUTHS RETURNING TO THE CENTERS ON THEIR OWN INITIATIVE

Respondents were also asked how many times they had returned to the centers without waiting to be asked. Sixty-four percent indicated that they had never returned to the centers on their own initiative. Seventeen percent reported that they had returned once, and 12 percent said that they had returned two to three times on their own.

Table 8

NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENTS RETURNED ON THEIR OWN INITIATIVE

"How many times have you gone back go (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) since the time we interviewed you?"

Times Returned on own Initiative	Total 201-100%
0	63.7
1	17.4
2	6.0
3	6.0
4	1.0
5	4.0
6	0.5
7	---
8	0.5
9 or more	1.0

4742

Of those who had returned, 22 percent returned within the first week; and another 22 percent returned within the first month. Twenty-one percent waited more than a month before returning, and 36 percent did not remember the elapsed time.

Table 9

TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN INTAKE INTERVIEW AND RESPONDENTS FIRST RETURN TO CENTER (ON OWN INITIATIVE)

Total	201
Did not return on their own initiative	128
Total returned to center on their own initiative	73

Elapsed Time	Total 73=100%
Up to one week	21.9
One week to one month	21.9
More than one month	20.5
Don't remember	35.6

When asked why they had gone back to the centers on their own, the reason most frequently given was "to look for a job" (73 percent); 12 percent mentioned job training, 7 percent, "to find out why they hadn't gotten in touch with me"; testing and counseling were mentioned by very few of the respondents (3 percent and 4 percent respectively).

4743

RESPONDENTS' INTENTIONS IN COMING TO THE CENTERS

In response to the question, "When you went to the center, were you really looking for a job, or did you just want to see what they had to offer?" - 84 percent replied that they were really looking for jobs, 9 percent, that they just wanted to see what the center had to offer, and 7 percent said both. Those who said they were really looking for a job were, then asked if they had had any particular jobs in mind, to which 54 percent replied that they did. The types of jobs most often sought were as skilled workers or craftsmen, and as clerical and office personnel. (The jobs wanted were generally of the same type as those mentioned at the first intake interview.)

Table 10A

RESPONDENTS' INTENTIONS IN COMING TO THE CENTER

"When you went to (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) were you really looking for a job or did you just want to see what they had to offer?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Was really looking	84.1
Just wanted to see	9.0
Both	7.0

Table 10B

"Did you have any particular job in mind?"

Response	169=100%
Yes	53.8
No	45.6
No answer	0.6

47+.

Table 10C

"What job did you have in mind?"

Response	Total 91=100%
Skilled workers/craftsmen	35.2
Clerical/office workers	28.6
Service workers	14.3
Laborers	13.2
Professional, technical	12.1
Operatives	2.2

RESPONDENT NEEDS UNFILLED BY THE CENTERS

Respondents were asked: "Are there any things you wanted the center to do for you that they didn't do?" Sixty-two percent replied "yes". When asked what these things were, 83 percent of the responses came under the heading of "find me a job;" "find me a permanent/steady/better paying/specific job." Twenty percent of the responses referred to training (multiple responses totalled more than 100 percent).

Table 11A

RESPONDENTS' NEEDS UNFILLED BY THE CENTER

"Are there any things you wanted the center to do for you that they did not do?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	62.2
No	37.8

4743

Table 11B

"What did you want them to do that they didn't?"

Total	201
Did not expect more of the center	76
Total expecting more	125

Response	Total* 125=100%
Get me a job	71.2
Get me training	20.0
Get me a (full-time) permanent/steady job	5.6
Get me a (good/better) paying job (pay too low)	4.0
Teach me a trade, help me catch up on my education	2.4
Get me a (specified) job	1.6
Miscellaneous	0.8

---

*Multiple responses total more than 100 percent.

CENTER PROCEDURES DISLIKED BY THE RESPONDENTS

Respondents appear to object more to types of or training positions jobs they are offered at the centers than to center procedures and requirements. Twenty percent (only 40) of the respondents indicated that there were things the centers wanted them to do that they didn't like or want to do; most often mentioned was to accept positions or jobs they didn't like. Of this 20 percent, 35 percent said they did not want to "join the Job Corps." 23 percent replied that they did not like the jobs the centers wanted them to take. Other things mentioned were: "go back to school" (12 percent), "they kept on asking me to come back" (12 percent).

Table 12A

"Were there any things that they wanted you to do that you didn't want or didn't like to do?"

Response	Total 201-100%
Yes	19.9
No	80.1

Table 12B

THINGS THE RESPONDENTS DIDN'T WANT TO DO

Total	201	
Had nothing asked they didn't want to do	161	
Total not liking things asked to do	40	
Things Not Liked	40=100%	
Join the Job Corps	14	35.0%
Didn't like the job they wanted me to do	9	22.5
Go back to school	5	12.5
They kept on asking me to come back	5	12.5
Miscellaneous	4	10.0
Don't know/no answer	3	7.5

4747

Respondents were also asked if there was anything about the way things were done at the centers that made them not want to go back; 32 percent answered yes. When asked what these were, the most frequent comments were: "It took too long to get me a job" (30 percent); "You sit there for hours waiting" (20 percent); and "You had to keep coming back" (14 percent). Nine percent mentioned the counselor(s)' attitude, and 8 percent said that there were too many tests. Thus, the majority (about two-thirds) of the respondents appear to be reasonably satisfied with the intake centers.

Table 13A

"Was there anything about the way things were done at (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) that made you not want to come back?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	31.8
No	67.7
No answer	0.5

Table 13B

"What was that which made you not want to go back?"

Things Done at Centers	Total 64=100%
It took too long to get me a job	29.7
You had to sit there for hours waiting	20.3
You had to keep coming back	14.1
The counselor's attitude	9.4
Too much confusion, rushed, hectic	6.2
They had too many tests	7.8
Ask too many questions, talk/no action	4.7
Miscellaneous	7.8
Don't know	4.7
No answer	1.6

4748

Most (78 percent) of the respondents discussed with their families the idea of going to the intake centers, and very few (4 percent) reported that members of their families had influenced them for or against the centers. Virtually none of the respondents' families exhibited any opposition to the youths' seeking work at the intake centers.

Table 14A

"Did you discuss your visit to (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) with your family?"

Response	Total 201-100%
Yes	78.1
No	18.9
No family	3.0

Table 14B

"Was there anything that someone in your family said that made you decide not to go back?"

Response	Total 157=100%
Yes	3.8
No	95.5
No answer	0.6

JOB OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED BY THE INTAKE CENTERS

Table 1 through 5 above noted the respondents' reporting of the number of times the centers asked them to return for such reasons as counseling, testing, and so forth. Sixty-two percent of the youths reported that they had not been called back.
The respondents were also asked if the centers had ever offered them a job or other assignment, or had sent them a letter to come in for

an assignment. Seventy-eight percent of the youths reported that the centers had not offered them any jobs, and had not sent them any job notification letters. HARYOU-Act respondents reported a somewhat higher level of activity in this respect than did the JOIN respondents.

Table 15

RESPONDENTS REPORTING JOB OFFERS FROM INTAKE CENTERS

"Did anyone at (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) offer you any jobs, or send you a letter to come in for a job?"

Response	Total 201=100%	HARYOU 64=100%	JOIN 137=100%
Yes	22.4	31.2	18.2
No	77.6	68.7	81.8

One-third of the 45 respondents who were called in for a job heard from the centers within a month of their intake interviews. Of those 45, 38 (84 percent) reported that they went in to see about the jobs. (See Tables 16A, 16B and 16C.) Of those who went in, 11 (29 percent) reported that they refused the jobs offered; principal reason: the pay was too low. Of the 11 jobs offered, none paid more than $75 per week; the median was $49.

Of the 38 respondents who went in to discuss the jobs about which the center had notified them, 24 (64 percent) reported that they had followed up and gone for a job interview. Of these 9 reported that they had gotten the jobs. The second most frequent outcome: "They told me they would call me."

4750

Table 16A

TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN INTAKE AND JOB OFFER

"About how long after you first went there did they call you back to offer you a job?"

Total	201	
Not offer a job	156	
Total offered a job	45=100%	
Response		
Up to one week	20	44.4
One week to one month	15	33.3
More than one month	3	6.7
Don't remember	1	2.2
No response	6	13.3

Table 16B

RESPONDENTS GOING IN TO SEE ABOUT JOB OFFER

"Did you go in to see about the job?"

Response	Total 45=100%	
Yes	38	84.4
No	7	15.6

4751

Table 16C

WEEKLY PAY OF JOBS REFUSED BY RESPONDENTS

Weekly Pay	Total 11= 100%	
$40 or less	3	27.3%
$41-$45	1	9.1
$46-$50	2	18.2
$51-$55	1	9.1
$56-$60	1	9.1
$61-$65	2	18.2
$66-$75	1	9.1
Median		$49

Table 17

RESPONDENTS FOLLOWING UP ON JOBS NOT REFUSED

"Did you go for an interview to the place of employment to see about (that job)?"

Response	Total 38-100%	
Yes	25	65.8
No	8	21.1
Don't know/ no answer	5	13.2

RESPONDENTS' OVERALL OPINIONS OF CENTER OPERATIONS

Respondents were asked if they had "a good opinion, or not such a good opinion of the way things were handled at the center." Sixty-five percent reported having a good opinion. Principal reason for having a good opinion: "they are helping people to get jobs"; principal reason for not having a good opinion: "they were too slow in finding jobs."

4752

Table 18A

RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS OF THE INTAKE CENTERS

"Did you have a good opinion or not such a good opinion of the way things were handled at the center?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Had good opinion	65.2
Not a good opinion	31.3
Don't know/didn't get that far	0.5
Don't know/no answer	3.0

Table 18B

Reasons for Good Opinion	Total 131=100%*
They are helping people get jobs	29.0
Things were well-organized	16.8
Interviewer shows a lot of interest in you	10.7
They did their best to get me a job	10.7
People were nice/friendly	9.2
They train people; they teach you a trade	6.9
It wasn't slow; I didn't have to wait long	5.3
They talk to me like a gentleman	3.8
Miscellaneous/don't know/no answer	15.3

* Multiple responses exceed 100%

4753

Table 18C

Reasons for Not Having Good Opinion	Total 63=100%
They were too slow in finding jobs	31.7
I had to wait there for hours.	15.9
You had to keep coming back.	12.7
Because of the confusion there/ not orderly	11.1
They said they would notify me, but never did.	6.3
They didn't treat me as an individual	4.8
Nobody spoke to us/tried to help us	3.2
Miscellaneous	15.9
Don't know/no answer	4.8

In response to the question, "Did they seem to know what they were doing or didn't they seem to know?", 84 percent reported that they did seem to know. Principal reasons given for seeming to know what they were doing: "They find people jobs," and "They find out what you can do and try to help you." Among those who felt that the centers didn't seem to know what they were doing, the principal reason given was: "It didn't look like they were trying to find me a job."

Table 19A

RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON CENTER ORGANIZATION

"Did they seem to know what they were doing or not?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Knew what they were doing	84.1
Didn't know what they were doing	12.9
Don't know/didn't get that far	0.5
Don't know/no answer	2.5

Table 19B

REASONS FOR FEELING THAT CENTERS KNEW WHAT THEY WERE DOING

"Why do you feel they knew what they were doing?"

Response	Total 169=100%
They were so organized	21.3
They find people jobs	26.6
They find out what you can do and try to help you	20.1
They could explain things well	8.3
Miscellaneous	5.9
Don't know/no answer	19.5

The respondents were then asked if there were any procedures at the centers which appeared to them to be unnecessary or a waste of time: Twenty percent replied "yes". When asked what these were, principal references were: "You have to wait hours," "They ask too many useless questions," and "The tests."

Table 20A

RESPONDENT VIEWS OF CENTER OPERATIONS

"Were there any things that they did at the intake center that you thought unnecssary or a waste of time?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	19.9
No	78.6
Don't know/didn't get that far	0.5
Don't know/no answer	1.0

Table 20B

CENTER OPERATIONS VIEWED AS UNNFCESSARY OR A WASTE OF TIME

"What things were unnecessary or a waste of time?"

Response	Total 40=100%*	
You have to wait hours	11	27.5
They ask too many useless questions	10	25.0
The tests	7	17.5
You came there and they didn't have anything for you	5	12.5
You had to keep going back	3	7.5
Miscellaneous	4	10.0
Don't know/no answer	1	2.5

*MULTIPLE RESPONSES EXCEED 100%

CENTER RECRUITMENT FOR JOB AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Respondents were asked if anyone at the centers had mentioned The Neighborhood Youth Corps to them. to which 25 percent answered

4756

yes. When asked what they had been told about the Corps, respondents' most frequent response was that it was a job, a chance to work (22 percent); their next most frequent response referred to was "training." More HARYOU than JOIN respondents reported hearing about the Corps at the Center.

Table 21A

CENTER RECRUITMENT FOR NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

"When you were at center, did anyone ever mention the Neighborhood Youth Corps to you?"

Response	Total 201=100%	HARYOU 64=100%	JOIN 137=100%
Yes	25.4	39.1	19.0
No	74.1	60.9	80.3
No answer	0.5	---	0.7

Table 21B

"What did they tell you about the Neighborhood Youth Corps?"

Response	Total * 51-100%
It was a job/chance to work	21.6
Training	17.6
Education/work and education	9.8
We get paid	9.8
Progress in future	5.9
For school drop-outs	3.9
Miscellaneous	29.4
Don't know/no answer	25.5

---

*Multiple responses exceed 100 percent

4757

When asked about the Job Corps, 62 percent (more than twice the number reporting being told of the Neighborhood Youth Corps) responded that the centers had mentioned it. (More JOIN than HARYOU respondents reported this.) When asked what they had been told, the respondents most frequently reported: "They train you" and "They send you out of town".

Table 22A

CENTER RECRUITMENT FOR THE JOB CORPS

"Did anyone there mention the Job Corps?"

Response	Total 201=100%	HARYOU 64=100%	JOIN 137=100%
Yes	62.2	43.8	70.8
No	37.8	56.2	29.2

Table 22B

"What did they tell you about the Job Corps?"

Total	201
Not told of Job Corps	76
Total Told About Job Corps	125=100%*
Response	
They would train you	56.0
They send you out of town	53.6
About payments	36.8
You would go to school	8.0
Job after you finished	8.0
You would go for 6 mos./ for long time	5.6
They can get you jobs	2.4
Miscellaneous	5.6
Don't remember/no answer	16.0

---

*Multiple responses exceed 100 percent.

4758

When asked if any other job or training programs had been mentioned, 22 percent replied "yes". Reported as not frequently mentioned: The Police CadetTraining Program

Table 23A

CENTER RECRUITMENT FOR OTHER PROGRAMS

"Did anyone there mention any other job or training programs to you?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	21.9
No	78.1

Table 23B

"What job or training program did they mention?"

Program Mentioned	Total 44=100%
Training for a trade/job (no program named)	36.4
Police Cadet Training Program	22.7
M.D.T.A.	4.5
Miscellaneous (YIA, JOIN Center Programs)	13.6
Don't remember	22.7

CENTERS' ROLES IN DECISIONS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL (Not tabulated)

Respondents were asked if they had returned to school since their first interview. Twenty-seven (14 percent) replied that they had. Of these, 15 (7 percent) had returned to full-time school, and 12 (6 percent) had returned to part-time school. (More HARYOU-Act than JOIN respondents returned to school.)

When asked if anyone at the centers had said anything that made them decide to return to school, one-third replied "yes". When asked if anyone else had said anything that made them decide to return, almost half (48 percent) replied "yes"; these were, for the most part, family members. It would thus appear that pressures to return to school came both from the respondents' families and from the centers.

Table 24A

RESPONDENTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

"Since we last saw you, have you returned to school?"

Total	201		
High School graduates	14		
		HARYOU	**JOIN**
Total School Drop-outs	187=100%	60=100%	127=100%
Response			
Yes	14.4	25.0	9.4
No	85.6	75.0	90.6

Table 24B

"Are you going to school full-time or part-time?"

Response		Total 27=100%
Full-time	15	55.6
Part-time	12	44.4

4760

Table 24C

"Did anyone else say anything that made you decide to return to school?"

Response	Total 27-100%	
Yes	13	48.1
No	12	44.4
No answer	2	7.4

CENTERS' REMEDIATION SERVICES

Respondents not working full time were asked if the centers had classes in reading and mathematics. Forty-three percent said yes, 4 percent said "no", and 53 percent did not know. (More JOIN than HARYOU respondents referred to these classes.) When asked if they would attend such classes if the centers asked them to, seventy-three percent of those who knew of the classes answered that they would.

Table 25A

RESPONDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF CENTER REMEDIATION PROGRAMS AND WILLINGNESS TO USE THEM

"Does HARYOU/JOIN have any classes in reading and mathematics?"

	Total		HARYOU		JOIN	
Total	201=100%		64=100%		137=100%	
Respondents working full time	80					
Total number asked	121=100%		40=100%		81=100%	
Responses						
Yes	52	43.0	10	25.0	42	51.8
No	5	4.1	3	7.5	2	2.6
Don't know/no answer	64	52.8	27	67.5	37	45.7

4761

Table 25B

"If they ask you to attend any classes in reading and math, will you expect to go?"

Response	Total 52=100%
Yes	73.1
No	26.9

RESPONDENT USE OF OTHER CENTERS

Twenty-two percent of the respondents reported that they had gone to other centers looking for work since their Phase 1 interview. These other centers included the Urban League and Youth in Action, as well as other JOIN and HARYOU-Act centers. Of these 44 respondents, 16 reported that they were seeing counselors at these other centers. Only one respondent reported attending classes in reading and arithmetic at these other centers.

RESPONDENT INTENTIONS TO RETURN TO CENTERS IF ASKED TO COME IN

Respondents were asked: "If (HARYOU-Act/JOIN) sends you any more job notices, do you intend to go in and see about them?" Eighty-five percent said yes, 14 percent replied "no". When those who replied "no" were asked why they did not intend to go in, their responses were: poor opinion of center (most frequent); entering armed services/Job Corps or other programs; or returning to school. (These are based on only 16 respondents.)

4762

Table 26

RESPONDENTS' INTENTIONS FOR RETURNING TO CENTER

"If HARYOU-Act/JOIN sends you any more job notices, do you intend to see about them?"

Total	201
Working full-time	88
Total not working full time	113=100%
Response	
Yes	85.0
No	14.2
Don't know	0.9

RESPONDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Respondents were asked: "Before this interview, had you ever heard of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?" Sixty-six percent replied that they had. When asked what they had heard about it, the most frequent description of it was that it was a job (39 percent); the next most frequent, that it was "job training" (27 percent).

Table 27A

RESPONDENTS' PRIOR KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

"Before this interview, had you ever heard of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?"

Response	Total 201=100%
Yes	65.7
No	20.3
No answer	4.0

4763

Table 27B

"What have you heard about the Neighborhood Youth Corps?"

Response	Total* 132=100%
It was a job (training not mentioned)	39.4
Job training (unspecified)	27.3
It helps people progress	10.6
You get education	6.8
We get paid	6.1
It is for school drop-outs	5.3
You work part-time/go to school part-time	0.8
It would keep me out of trouble	0.8
Miscellaneous	6.1
Don't know/no answer	17.4

---

*Multiple responses exceed 100 percent

Of these 132 respondents who had heard of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 99 (75 percent) said they thought joining the Corps was a good idea, 11 percent (15) thought it was not such a good idea, and 14 percent (18) did not know. Of those who had previously heard of the Corps, 39 percent reported that friends of theirs had joined the Corps. Somewhat more Harlem respondents reported that friends of theirs had joined the Neighborhood Youth Corps than did Beford-Stuyvesant respondents but the numbers are too small for any conclusions to be drawn.

4764

Table 28A

RESPONDENTS' VIEW OF JOINING THE YOUTH CORPS

"Do you think joining the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a good idea or not such a good idea?"

Total	201
Had never heard of NYC	69
Total	132=100%
Response	
Good idea	75.0
Not such a good idea	11.4
Don't know	13.6

Table 28B

FRIENDS OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE JOINED THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

"Have any of your friends joined the Neighborhood Youth Corps that you know of?"

		HARYOU	JOIN
Total	201		
Never heard of NYC	69		
Total	132=100%	51=100%	81=100%
Response			
Yes	39.4	56.9	28.4
No	56.1	39.2	66.7
No friends	0.8	---	1.2
No answer	3.8	3.9	3.7

4765

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HARYOU-ACT AND JOIN RESPONDENTS

Data in the Phase 1 Report indicated that there were strong and systematic differences between respondents living in Central Harlem (HARYOU-Act) and in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn (JOIN). The differences included more favorable economic conditions among the HARYOU-Act respondents, as reflected in greater job experience, higher earnings, and higher self-image and work-attitude scores than are to be found among the Bedford-Stuyvesant respondents.

Data of the Phase 2 Report indicate that the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant groups are represented in Phase 2 in about the same proportions: HARYOU-Act accounted for 28 percent of the Phase 1 respondents, and for 32 percent of the Phase 2 respondents (the difference is not statistically significant).

With respect to views of the intake centers, differences in response appear to reflect differences in the organization and administration of the two centers, which differ in size, location, and in the numbers of centers maintained in their respective neighborhoods. No certain conclusions can be drawn, therefore, regarding the differences between the two centers.* Nevertheless,

---

* It should also be noted that the HARYOU-Act center normally referred applicants to other Harlem agencies and was, therefore, not primarily prepared to serve as an intake center as was JOIN. It served as an intake center partly as an accommodation to New York University for this study.

4766

the following differences were noted: the JOIN center seemed to follow up on respondents more than the HARYOU-Act center, and followed up somewhat more promptly. HARYOU-Act produced more job offers for the applicants, than did JOIN (Table 15); JOIN evoked better opinions among its applicants on some items, but the differences were not striking. More JOIN than HARYOU-Act respondents mentioned having heard of the Job Corps, while slightly more of the latter had heard more of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

However, none of the differences were large enough or systematic enough to generate the conclusion that the two centers function in a radically different manner.

4767

Chapter III

RESPONDENT CAREERS SINCE FIRST INTAKE INTERVIEW

JOB HISTORIES SINCE INTAKE

Respondents were asked if they had had any full-time jobs since their intake interviews. Thirty-four percent reported that they had not had any full-time jobs, 47 percent, that they had had one; and 13 percent that they had had two, and 3 percent that they had had three or more. Eighty respondents (40 percent) indicated that they were holding full-time jobs at the time of their Phase 2 interviews, and two of these had also returned to full-time school. Thus, while two-thirds of the respondents were able to get jobs on their own, less than half were apparently able to get jobs at which they were able or willing to stay for an appreciable length of time.

Table 29

RESPONDENTS' FULL-TIME JOB EXPERIENCE SINCE FIRST INTAKE INTERVIEW

Number of Full-Time Jobs Held	Total 201=100%	HARYOU 64=100%	JOIN 137=100%
None	33.8	32.8	34.3
One	46.8	53.1	43.8
Two	13.4	14.1	13.1
Three	2.0	----	2.9
Four	0.5	----	0.7
Five or more	0.5	----	0.7
No answer	3.0	----	4.4
Median	1	1	1

4768

Table 30

*RESPONDENTS' PART-TIME EXPERIENCE SINCE FIRST INTAKE INTERVIEW

Number of Part-Time Jobs Held	Total 201=100%	HARYOU 64=100%	JOIN 137=100%
None	80.6	78.1	81.8
One	14.9	15.6	14.6
Two	2.0	4.7	0.7
Three	0.5	----	0.7
Four	1.5	1.6	1.5
Five or more	0.5	----	0.7

RESPONDENTS' PART-TIME JOB EXPERIENCE

Eighty-one percent of the respondents reported that they had had no part-time jobs since their intake interviews, 15 percent had had one part-time job, 4 percent had had two or more part-time jobs.

Nine respondents indicated that they were working part time at the time of their Phase 2 interview, and one of these had also returned to part-time school. (See Table 31 following.)

RESPONDENTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

As shown in Table 30 above, 15 (8 percent) of the respondents reported that they had returned to full-time school; 12 (6 percent) reported that they had returned to part-time school.

---

* The number of respondents who had had neither full-time nor part-time jobs in the three-months' interim was 51 (25 percent of the total group).

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENT STATUS AT TIME OF PHASE 2 INTERVIEW

Table 31

RESPONDENT STATUS AT TIME OF PHASE 2 INTERVIEW

Status	201=100%		Total
Working full-time	78*	38.8	
Working part-time	8	4.0	
In full-time school	15	7.5	
In part-time school	12	6.0	
Unemployed	88	43.8	

---

* Two respondents reporting that they had returned to full-time school and were holding full-time jobs, are here classified as in full-time school; one respondent reporting that he was both working part-time and was in part-time school is here classified as in part-time school.

Table 31 summarizes the status of the respondents at the time of their Phase 2 interviews. Slightly less than 40 percent were working full time; nearly 8 percent were back in full-time school. If full-time employment and/or returning to school full-time are to be regarded as satisfactory solutions to the problems of these youths, or at least first steps towards satisfactory solutions, then evidently about half the respondents had made positive progress, and the rest could be regarded as still being in need of services by these agencies. Furthermore, it remains questionable whether the types of employment generally available to the respondents - the

4770

successions of casual, low-paying jobs reported by these youths in their intake interviews - can be regarded as stable lasting solutions to their needs.

RESPONDENTS WORKING FULL-TIME

The 78 respondents reporting that they were working full time, and the 2 reporting that they were both working full-time and were in school full-time, were queried about their jobs.

Type of Firm

Asked what type of firm they were employed by ("What does the firm you work for do?"), these 80 respondents' three most frequent answers were: manufacturers, service establishments (cleaners, carwash, laundries, etc.), and offices. Employment by such organizations as hospitals and universities was not reported by any of the respondents. But it should be noted that 5 of the 80 respondents reported working for such city agencies as the Board of Education and the New York City Housing Authority and that 5 more reported employment in youth employment programs at such agencies as Youth in Action, HARYOU, etc. The positions with city agencies may be part of youth employment programs. Thus, the number of respondents who have found employment in jobs outside youth employment programs may be 70, or 35 percent, of all respondents. (Patterns of

4771

employment appear to differ between the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant respondents, but the small numbers involved make it difficult to draw any conclusions.)

Table 32

TYPES OF FIRM FOR WHICH RESPONDENTS WORK FULL TIME

"What does the organization you work for do?"

Type of Firm	Total 80=100%
Manufacturers	32.5
Service establishments	16.3
Offices	15.0
Retail outlets	11.3
Distributors	7.5
City agencies (Board of Educ., City Housing Authority)	6.3
Work training programs (JOIN Special Training, YIA, HARYOU)	6.3
Restaurants	5.0

Types of Job

The most frequent duties reported by the respondents, when asked in what capacity they were employed ("What do you do on your full-time job?") were: service worker, laborer, clerical or office jobs and operative.

4772

Table 33

TYPE OF FULL-TIME JOBS

"What do you do on your full-time job?"

Type of Work	Total 80=100%
Service worker	28.7
Laborer	23.7
Clerical, office	21.2
Operatives	12.5
Skilled worker/craftsman	8.7
Professional, technical	3.7
Sales	1.2

Salaries Earned

The median reported salary earned was $57 per week. (There was no difference between the JOIN and HARYOU respondents.) Twenty percent of the respondents were earning less than $50 per week; 6 percent of the respondents were earning more than $75 per week. It would appear that the Neighborhood Youth Corps "competes" for these youth with the regular job market, and at a lower salary rate. (See Table 34, p. 66.)

Sources of Jobs

More than half the respondents who were working full time got their jobs through friends or relatives (53 percent); the other jobs

Table 34

SALARIES EARNED ON FULL-TIME JOBS

Salary Earned	Total 80=100%
$40 or less	8.7
$41-$45	2.5
$46-$50	10.0
$51-$55	18.7
$56-$60	22.5
$61-$65	15.0
$66-$75	15.0
$76 and over	6.2
No answer	1.2
Median	$57

came from a variety of sources. The sources mentioned next in frequency were: the State Employment Service (15 percent), various intake centers including HARYOU, JOIN, PAL, etc. (9 percent), and private employment agencies (6 percent). (The HARYOU and JOIN centers referred to are those other than centers at which the Phase 1 interviews were held.)

This reiterates the pattern indicated in the Phase 1 report, in which the respondents indicated their reliance on friends and

4774

relatives as the principal sources of jobs, or of leads to jobs, and their unwillingness or inability to seek, and find, employment through more formal channels.

Table 35

SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' FULL-TIME JOB

Source	Total 80=100%
Friends, relatives	52.5
State employment agency	15.0
HARYOU, JOIN, PAL, YOC	8.7
Just walked in and asked	7.5
Private employment agency	6.2
Miscellaneous	5.0
"A job agency"	3.7
Newspaper ad	1.2

Overall Likes and Dislikes of the Job

Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated that all in all they liked their current jobs, 29 percent disliked them, 6 percent replied "don't know." When those who liked their jobs were asked why, the most frequent responses were: the type of work (33 percent), easy work (31 percent), the people (19 percent), and "getting paid" (15 percent). Among those who disliked their job, the most frequent reasons for disliking it were: low pay (57 percent), the work (39 percent), and the boss (17 percent), but it should be noted that these are the responses of only 23 persons.

Table 36A

OVERALL LIKES AND DISLIKES OF PRESENT JOB

"All in all, would you say you like the job or dislike it?"

Total	201
Without full-time job	121
Total with full-time job	80=100%
Response	
Like it	65.0
Dislike it	28.7
Don't know	6.2

Table 36B

REASONS FOR LIKING JOB

Response	Total* 52=100%	
The type of work	17	32.7
Easy work	16	30.8
The people	10	19.2
Getting paid	8	15.4
Chance for advancement	6	11.5
I'm learning, get training	3	5.8
Keeps me out of trouble	1	1.9
Miscellaneous	7	13.5
No special feeling	1	1.9

---

* Multiple responses exceed 100 percent.

Things Learned on the Job

Sixty-nine percent (55) of the 80 employed respondents said that they had learned things on their jobs. Of these, 82 percent (45 of the 55) mentioned specific job skills as the things they had learned; 44 of the 55 (80 percent) said that these things were worth learning, the reason most frequently given: they were good experience for the future.

Table 37A

"Have you learned anything on your job?"

Response	Total 80=100%
Yes	68.7
No	31.2

Table 37B

"What have you learned on your job?"

Response	Total 55=100%
Specific job skills	81.8
How to get along with people	7.3
How to speak to people (manners)	1.8
Sense of responsibility	3.6
Miscellaneous	7.3

4777

Table 37C

"Do you think the things you have learned are worth doing?"

Response	Total 55=100%
Yes	80.0
No	18.2
Don't know/no answer	1.8

Table 37D

"Why are they worth learning?"

Response	Total 44=100%	
Good experience for future	30	68.2
Learn to get along with other people	3	6.8
Learn to fix things for personal use	1	2.3
Good money in the field	3	6.8
Good field	1	2.3
Teaches you to accept responsibility	1	2.3
Miscellaneous	4	9.1
Don't know/no answer	2	4.5

Respondents' Views of Their Salary

The respondents do not appear to regard their jobs as rewarding neither with respect to the pay or the prospects of pay, nor with respect to the work itself.

4778

Thus, respondents were asked if they thought they were being paid too little, too much, or about right for what they did. About half (49 percent) thought they were being paid too little, the principal reason being: "I do a lot of work." Fifty-one percent thought they were being paid just about the right amount for what they did, but when asked why, gave as principal reason, that there was very little work to be done.

None of the respondents thought they were being overpaid.

Table 38A

"Do you think that your employer is paying you too much, too little, or about right for what you do?"

Response	Total 80=100%
Too little	48.7
The right amount	51.2

Table 38B

"Why is the amount too little?"

Response	Total 39=100%
Not enough to live on	17.9
I do a lot of work	48.7
Because of working conditions	15.4
Had previous experience	10.3
Miscellaneous	2.6
Don't know/no answer	10.3

4779

Table 38C

"Why is it the right amount for what you do?"

Response	Total* 41=100%	
I am not experienced	9	22.0
The work is not that difficult	7	17.1
There is very little work to be done	16	39.0
The pay is enough for my needs	1	2.4
Miscellaneous	5	12.2
Don't know/no answer	4	9.8

---

* Multiple responses exceed 100 percent.

Those who considered their salary too little were asked how much would be the right amount for the work they do. The median salary mentioned was $72 per week; as noted above, the median salary actually earned was $57 per week.

Table 38D

"How much per week would be right for this job?"

Response	Total 39=100%	
$46-$50	1	2.6
$51-$55	1	2.6
$56-$60	4	10.3
$61-$65	8	20.5
$66-$75	9	23.1
$76-$85	10	25.6
$86-$95	2	5.1
$96 or over	3	7.7
Don't know/no answer	1	2.6
Median	$72	

4780

Respondents' View of Their Jobs as Temporary or Permanent

Seventy percent (56) of the respondents regard their job as short-term; the rest as long-term. The principal reason for regarding the job as long-term was that there were good chances for promotion; of the 24 respondents who saw their jobs as long-term, 23 thought they had a good chance of promotion if they stayed with their jobs. Those who considered the job as only temporary gave, as principal reason, that the kind of work they were doing was not what they wanted for their careers. That the pay was too low was mentioned by about one-fifth of the respondents (18 percent).

Table 39

RESPONDENTS' VIEWS OF THEIR JOBS AS TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT

"Do you regard your job as permanent or just temporary?"

Response	Total 80=100%	
Permanent	24	30.0
Temporary	56	70.0

4781

Table 40

REASONS FOR REGARDING JOB AS TEMPORARY

Response	Total* 56=100%	
It's not the kind of work I want for my career.	19	33.9
I want to get something better.	11	19.6
The pay is too low.	10	17.9
I plan to return to school.	10	17.9
I want something in a specific field.	5	8.9
This is for training only.	3	5.4
Miscellaneous	5	8.9

---

* Multiple responses exceed 100 percent.

Summary of Data on the Respondents Working Full-Time

The Phase 1 respondents gave, at their first intake interview, a picture of their employment history as consisting of a cycle of poorly paid, dead-end jobs, when they were able to obtain jobs at all. Those who were interviewed as part of Phase 2 indicate little or no change in that picture. It would appear from the reports of the 80 respondents who had found and were still holding full-time jobs without the help of the intake centers, that many of the jobs described were part of the same cycle, and evoke similar attitudes and patterns of performance, especially as indicated by the turnover rates reported.

Many of the jobs apparently were not regarded as intrinsically interesting or satisfying enough for the youths to stay on for any significant lengths of time. Nor do they appear to offer satisfactory salary levels. Thus, 30 percent of the respondents replied that they disliked their jobs; 65 percent who liked their jobs gave as the principal reasons pleasant or easy work, rather than the salaries ($57 per week was the median).

Those who reported that they were satisfied with their salaries apparently did so because the jobs were undemanding. Furthermore, if the 80 jobs held at the point of the Phase 2 interviews are samples of the other jobs held during the time between Phases 1 and 2, and are possibly better than those left during the interim, then the disadvantages may be even greater on those other jobs. Most of these youths do not appear to have solved their career problems on their own.

The instability of this type of job experience is highlighted by the data of Table 29, indicating that in the 3 months between their Phase 1 and Phase 2 interviews, 133 (66 percent) of the 201 respondents had had a full-time job (of which 80 were employed at the time of their Phase 2 interview), and that some had had three or more full-time jobs during that three-month period.

Many of these respondents do not appear to have altered or escaped from the cycle of unstable and futureless job experience in which Negroes find themselves.

4783

RESPONDENTS NOT WORKING

It was originally planned to compare the Phase 2 respondents who were working full time with those who had returned to school, and also with those still unemployed. However, the number of those who had returned to school was too small for useful analysis; and the following material is therefore a comparison of respondents working full-time and all others on the panel, for selected items of the questionnaire.

Level of Schooling

Respondents with lower levels of education were either less successful in obtaining employment or less active in seeking it. Those who completed 9th grade or less constitute 19 percent of those working, and 31 percent of those not working at the time of the interview. Conversely, those who completed 11th grade or higher constituted 53 percent of those working at the time of their Phase 2 interviews, and 41 percent of those not working full-time. (See Table 41, p. 77.)

Age of Respondents

It would appear that younger respondents either have greater difficulty in finding employment or seek it less. Sixteen- and 17-year olds comprised 25 percent of those working, and 44 percent of

4784

those not working. Respondents 18 years and older accounted for 75 percent of those working, and 56 percent of those not working. Obviously, these two variables, level of schooling completed and age, are not independent.

Table 41

LEVEL OF SCHOOLING BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Highest Grade Completed	Total 201=100%	At time of Phase 2 interview Working 80=100%	 Not Working 121=100%
9th grade or less	25.9	18.7	30.6
10th grade	24.9	23.8	25.6
11th grade	20.9	23.8	19.0
12th grade	22.9	26.2	20.7
Some college or trade school	1.5	2.5	.8
No answer	3.9	5.0	3.3

Table 42

AGE OF RESPONDENTS, BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Age of Respondent	Total 201=100%	Working 80=100%	Not Working 121=100%
16 to 17 years	36.3	24.9	43.8
18 to 21 years	63.6	74.9	56.1

WORK ATTITUDES - Individual Items

The questions designed to measure commitment to work had consisted of eleven items. Analysis of the Phase 1 data had indicated

4785

that six appeared to be valid indicators and could be used as a scale. These six were used in testing Phase 2 respondents and are shown below.

Results indicate that the youths working full time at the time of their Phase 2 interviews were only slightly more committed to work than those who had not found work, or those who had returned to school. On five of the six work-attitude questions, those not employed reported commitments to work not significantly different from those who were employed; those employed appeared significantly more positive in their work attitudes only on the first item.

(a) "Work has no dignity, in my experience." Fourteen percent of those working agreed with this statement, as against 30 percent of those not working or back in school. (This difference is statistically significant.) (See Table 43A, p. 80.)

This is the only item for which those not working registered a significantly lower degree of commitment towards work than those working.

(b) "Work is the only way to survive in this world." Seventy-nine percent of those working agreed with this; 83 percent of those not working agreed. (This difference is too small to be statistically significant.) See Table 43B, p. 80.)

(c) "You don't have to work at a job you don't like, you can always go on relief." Sixteen percent of those working agreed with this statement, 19 percent of those not working agreed. (This difference is too small to be statistically significant.) (See Table 43C, p. 80.)

(d) "So long as I earn enough to live decently, I don't care too much what kind of work I do." Forty-one percent of those working agree; 48 percent of those not working agreed. (It may be that those working are somewhat more committed to work as a source of intrinsic interest and satisfaction than those now working, but the difference is not great enough to be regarded as statistically significant.) (See Table 43D, p. 80.)

(e) "On most jobs, you don't get ahead by working hard, you get ahead by knowing the right people." Forty-six percent of those working agreed; 42 percent of those not working agreed. The difference is too small to be statistically significant. (See Table 43E, p. 81.)

(f) "Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise." Ninety-five percent of those working agreed; 98 percent of those not working agreed. The difference is too small to be statistically significant. (See Table 43F, p. 81.)

4787

Table 43A

WORK ATTITUDES AMONG THOSE WORKING FULL-TIME

"Work has no dignity, in my experience."

Response	Total 201=100%	Working Full-Time 80=100%	All Others 121=100%
Agree	23.4	13.7	29.7
Disagree	70.1	81.2	62.8
Don't know/no answer	6.4	1.3	7.4

Table 43B

"Work is the only way to survive in this world."

Response			
Agree	81.6	78.7	83.4
Disagree	18.4	21.2	16.5

Table 43C

"You don't have to work at a job you don't like, you can always go on relief."

Response			
Agree	17.9	16.2	19.0
Disagree	81.6	83.7	80.1
Don't know/no answer	0.5	---	0.8

Table 43D

"So long as I earn enough to live decently, I don't care too much what kind of work I do."

Response			
Agree	45.3	41.2	47.9
Disagree	53.7	57.5	51.2
Don't know/no answer	1.0	1.2	0.8

WORK ATTITUDES AMONG THOSE WORKING FULL TIME (Con't)

Table 43E

"On most jobs you don't get ahead by working hard, you get ahead by knowing the right people."

Response	Total 201=100%	Working Full Time 80=100%	All Others 121=100%
Agree	43.8	46.2	42.1
Disagree	51.2	47.5	53.7
Don't know/no answer	5.0	6.3	4.1

Table 43F

"Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise."

Response			
Agree	96.5	95.0	97.5
Disagree	83.0	3.7	2.4
Don't know/no answer	0.5	1.2	---

Summary

Thus, on five of six items measuring attitudes toward work, there appeared to be no great or statistically significant difference between those employed and those not employed. Nevertheless, there is a consistency on the positive side exhibited by those working, which if observed among larger numbers, would be statistically significant.

4789

THE WORK ATTITUDE SCALE*

As noted, items analyzed individually above were shown in the Phase 1 report to operate as an attitude scale. That is to say, each respondent could be scored on a scale ranging from zero to six, to the degree that his agreement or disagreement with each of the six items indicated a favorable or unfavorable attitude towards work. Thus, for example, a respondent agreeing with the statement, "You don't have to work at a job you don't like, you can always go on relief," was scored zero for that item, or, if he disagreed, he was scored 1. A similar procedure was followed for each of the remaining five items. For example:

	Scale Value	
	Agree	Disagree
1. Work has no dignity, in my experience	0	1
2. Work is the only way to survive in this world.	1	0
3. You don't have to work at a job you don't like, you can always go on relief.	0	1
4. So long as I earn enough to live decently, I don't care too much what kind of work I do.	0	1
5. On most jobs, you don't get ahead by working hard, you get ahead by knowing the right people.	0	1
6. Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise.	1	0

---

*See Appendix.

4790

On the basis of norms established in the Phase 1 study, total scores of zero, one, or two were classified as below average; scores of three and four were classified as average, and scores of five and six as above average. Accordingly, the Phase 2 respondents exhibit the following work-attitude scores:

Table 44

PHASE 2 WORK ATTITUDE SCORES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Work Attitude Scores	Total 201=100%	Working Full-Time 80=100%	All Others 121=100%
Below average	6.0	2.5	8.3
Average	45.8	51.2	42.1
Above average	48.3	46.2	49.6

The work attitude scores of those respondents who were working do not appear to be much higher than of those not working.

Changes in Work Attitude Scores

Respondents' Phase 1 and Phase 2 work attitude scores appear to have been very stable in the time between the Phase 1 and 2 interviews; there appears a slight drift in the positive direction. It is not possible to estimate the proportion of the changes in work attitude scores due to "practice effect," that is, to the fact that respondents had answered these items before. The median and average changes were zero. Nearly two percent of the respondents had decreases of three or four points on a six-point scale; 11 percent had increases of greater than two. In sum, 31 percent of the respondents had no change in scores, 21 percent had negative changes, 48 percent had positive changes.

Among those working, there appeared to be no more positive shifts in work attitudes than among those not working, but fewer negative shifts (19 percent vs. 22 percent - which are too slight to be considered meaningful).

Table 45

CHANGES IN WORK ATTITUDE SCORES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Changes	Total 201=100%		Working Full-Time 80=100%		All Others 121=100%	
Negative	42	20.9	15	18.8	27	22.3
Zero	62	30.8	26	32.5	36	29.8
Positive	97	48.3	39	48.8	58	48.0

SELF-IMAGE AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

The Self-Image Scale

The Rosenberg self-image scale,* using nine items, was administered to all Phase 1 respondents, and repeated during their Phase 2 interviews. The scale used is as follows:

	Scale Value Agree	Scale Value Disagree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	1	0
2. At times, I think I am no good at all.	0	1

---

* Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, Princeton, 1965.

4792

	Scale Value	
	Agree	Disagree
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	1	0
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	1	0
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	0	1
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	0	1
7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	1	0
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	0	1
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	0	1

Phase 1 Self-Image Scores

If higher self-image scores are associated with more successful job-seeking, and lower scores with less, we would expect the distribution of Phase 1 scores to reflect this; but the differences, though in the direction expected, were too small to be statistically significant.

Table 46

PHASE 1 SELF-IMAGE SCORES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Self-Image Scores	Total 201=100%	Working Full-Time 80=100%	All Others 121=100%
Below average	23.4	21.3	24.8
Average	45.7	47.5	44.6
Above average	30.9	31.3	30.6

4793

The difference in current self-image scores between those respondents working full time and those not employed were too slight to be considered meaningful.

Table 47

CURRENT SELF-IMAGE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Current Score	Total 201=100%	Working Full-Time 80=100%	All Others 121=100%
Below average	8.0	6.2	9.1
Average	42.3	43.7	41.3
Above average	49.8	50.0	49.6

Changes in Self-Image Scores

Each respondent was scored on the change in his self-image score between the time of the two interviews. It appears that the self-image scores of the respondents have shown a slight increase during the three-month period. Twenty-two percent of the respondents showed no change in self-image scores; 19 percent showed decreases; 59 percent showed increases. The median change was +0.6 items; the average change was +1.2 items.

Conclusions are difficult to draw, for it is not possible to estimate that portion of the change in self-image scores which is due to "practice effect," i.e., to the fact that the respondents have answered these items before. Nevertheless, the following may be noted:

(a) Decreases in Self-Image Scores: occur with the same frequency among both the working and non-working groups (19 percent for each group).

(b) No Changes in Self-Image Scores: are most frequent among those not working than among those working (18 percent and 26 percent respectively).

(c) Increases in Self-Image Scores: are greater among those working than among those not working (63 percent and 54 percent respectively).

Though the changes recorded were slight,* the data nonetheless suggest that positive shifts in self-image may be associated with employment; but this observation is made more as a suggestion for future study than as a demonstrated conclusion.

Table 48A

CHANGES IN SELF-IMAGE SCORES BETWEEN PHASES 1 AND 2

	201=100%
-5	1.0
-4	1.5
-3	1.0
-2	5.0
-1	10.4
0	22.4
+1	13.9
+2	19.9
+3	9.5
+4	7.0
+5	5.0
+6	2.0
+7	1.0
+8	0.5
Median change	+0.6
Mean change	+1.2

---

* It may be that the three-month interim period was too brief a time span for significant changes to occur.

4733

Table 48B
CHANGES IN SELF-IMAGE SCORES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Changes	Total 201=100%	Working 80=100%	Not Working 121=100%
Decreases	18.9	20.0	18.2
Zeroes	22.4	17.5	25.6
Increases	58.7	62.5	56.2

It may be that change in self-image score can by directly related to the type of employment available to the respondent.

SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WORKING FULL TIME AND ALL OTHERS

Younger respondents, as well as those whose level of completed schooling is lower, were either less active in seeking employment, or less successful in obtaining it. With respect to work attitude responses, those working appeared only slightly more committed to work than those not working. Further, with respect to self-image scores, there appeared to exist some slight shift towards higher scores among those working than among those not working. Further analysis would be needed to determine the characteristics of those showing a positive shift in self-image score. It is not known, for example, whether the three-month interval between interviews is the most favorable for recording meaningful changes in self-image; a longer interval might prove more appropriate. But the small numbers of respondents in the Phase 2 study would render further analysis very difficult.

It should be emphasized that while the differences noted above are not marked, they nevertheless are fairly consistent across a number of the questionnaire items, and this consistency makes it plausible that a slight difference does in fact exist.

At the same time the above data in no way indicate that those not working are noticeably more impaired in terms of self-image or in terms of work attitude than those working, for as pointed out earlier, while there is a consistent difference, this difference appears to be minimal.

Youths Unemployed Over the Three-Month Interim

A further analysis was made, dividing the applicants into those who had had a full time job and those who had had no full time job between intake (Phase 1) and the follow-up (Phase 2) interviews.

Table 49

JOB EXPERIENCE SUBSEQUENT TO INTAKE
(Three Months Later)

	201=100%	
Had no full-time jobs	33.8	
Had full-time jobs	66.2=100%	
Not working full time at Phase two interview	26.4	39.8
Working full time at Phase two interview	39.8	60.1

4797

Of the Phase 2 respondents, one-third, as noted before, had had no full-time jobs; 26 percent had had one or more full-time jobs but were not working at the time of their Phase 2 interviews; and 40 percent were working full-time.

Of the various characteristics analyzed, only one produced a statistically significant result, that of the respondent's age: the younger respondents were either less active in seeking employment or less successful in obtaining it; those 16 and 17 years old accounted for 54 percent of those who had had no jobs, and 27 percent of those who had. It seems likely that this reflects the preferences of employers for applicants older than 16 and 17.

Self-image scores were not significantly different between those who had had jobs and those who had not, but were, in fact, slightly higher among those who had not.

Work attitude scores were slightly but not significantly better among those who had had jobs.

One work attitude datum is worthy of note: of those who had had no work experience, 82 percent expressed a preference for working, and 16 percent a preference for receiving money without working; but among those who had had jobs, 75 percent preferred working, and 23 percent preferred receiving money without working. The differences, however, are too slight to be meaningful.

It appears, then, that the failure to have had a job is explained primarily by the preference of employers for older applicants.

4798

Table 50

JOB EXPERIENCE SUBSEQUENT TO INTAKE

A. By Work Attitude Score		Subsequent Job Experience			
		Had no Full-Time Jobs	Had Full-Time Jobs		
Work Attitude Scores	Totals 201=100%	68=100%	Sub-Total 133=100%	Not Currently working 53=100%	Now Working 80=100%
Below average	18.4	22.1	16.5	18.9	15.0
Average	49.8	50.0	49.6	47.2	51.2
Above average	31.8	27.9	33.8	34.0	33.7
B. By Self-Image Scores					
Self-Image Score					
Below average	13.9	14.7	13.5	15.1	12.5
Average	44.3	41.2	45.9	45.3	46.2
Above average	40.8	44.1	39.1	37.7	40.0
C. By Age of Respondent					
Age					
16 and 17 years	36.3	54.4	27.1	30.2	28.0
18 and 19 years	39.8	30.9	44.4	45.3	43.7
20 and 21 years	23.9	14.7	28.6	24.5	31.2
D. Willingness to Receive Money as an Alternative to Working					
Preference					
Prefer to receive money	20.4	16.2	22.6	22.6	22.5
Would rather be working	77.6	82.4	75.2	75.5	75.0
No difference/don't know	2.0	1.5	2.3	1.9	2.5

4799

The data above suggests that there is no one stratum of these youths that is outstandingly more impaired or work-alienated than any other, which therefore would account for their failure to seek or find work. The Phase 1 study demonstrated the extent to which the entire panel scored below the norms of both white and Negro middle-class youths. Analysis within this extremely depressed group has not produced significant variations which can explain individual success or failure in finding employment.

Chapter IV

THE PHASE 1 PANEL IN RETROSPECT

The purpose of this chapter is to determine: (1) how the job applicants who were placed by the JOIN and HARYOU-Act centers on jobs in private employment differ from those placed in youth-work programs; (2) how the applicants who were placed by the centers differ from those not placed; (3) how those youths not placed and who responded to our requests for second interviews differ from those who did not come in to be interviewed.

The material of this chapter is drawn from both the original intake interviews and the Phase 2 interviews;and the applicants are classified according to their histories subsequent to intake.

I. Types of Placement - Differences Between Applicants Placed in Youth-Work Programs and Those Placed in Private Employment.

Of the 169 applicants placed by the centers during the data-gathering stage of this study, information was available regarding the types of placement made for 146. (See Table 51, p. 94.)

Of those placed, 57 percent were placed in jobs in the private sector; 43 percent in youth-work programs (with the Job Corps taking 68 percent of those assigned to youth-work programs, JOIN Special Training taking 16 percent of the placements, the Neighborhood Youth Corps 11 percent, and the M.D.T.A. 5 percent).

4801

Table 51

TYPE OF PLACEMENT

Total Applicants Placed	169	
No Record, Type of Placement	23	
	146=100%	
Direct Placements (private industry)	56.8	
Youth-Work Programs	43.2	= 100%
Job Corps	29.5	68.3
JOIN Special Training	6.8	15.9
Neighborhood Youth Corps	4.8	11.1
M.D.T.A.	2.1	4.8

Thus, of the total applicants placed by the centers and for whom records are available, the Neighborhood Youth Corps accounted for only 5 percent of the placements by these two centers during the time period of this study.

TYPE OF PLACEMENT ACCORDING TO YOUTH CHARACTERISTICS

Training for a Trade

Applicants had been asked, at intake, whether they had ever had training for a trade. Thirty-two percent of the original 601 applicants had reported having had training. Of those placed by the centers, 29 percent reported having had training for a trade. There was no difference between those placed in private employment and in youth-work programs with respect to previous training; and

4802

it would appear that prior training plays little or no part in evaluating or placing job applicants.

Age of Applicant

Age appears significantly related to chances of being placed in private employment: older applicants tended to be placed in private employment, younger applicants in youth-work programs. Youths under 18 accounted for 50 percent of placements in youth-work programs, and 21 percent of direct placements; applicants 19 and over accounted for 58 percent of direct placements and 24 percent of youth-work program placements.

It is possible that these differences in placement are indicators of a preference on the part of private employers for older applicants.

Highest Grade of Schooling

Those with lower levels of schooling were placed to a somewhat greater extent in youth-work programs, those with higher levels accounted for a somewhat greater percentage of direct placements but the differences are not statistically significant. Since age and level of school may be considered to be related, the differences in schooling may simply reflect the age differentials noted above.

4805

Self-Image Scores

Applicants with above average self-image scores were 38 percent of the placements in youth-work programs, 29 percent of direct placements. (The differences are not statistically significant.) Thus, applicants who are psychologically somewhat stronger appear more likely to be placed not in private employment but in youth-work programs. The reasons for this are not fully clear.

Work Attitude Scores

Those assigned to youth-work programs appear slightly better in work-attitude scores than those placed in private industry; above average scores were 43 percent of work-program assignments, 39 percent of direct placements. Below average scores were 22 percent of direct placements, 18 percent of work-program assignments. (The differences are not statistically significant.)

Miscellaneous Attitudinal Items

Analysis of the Phase 1 data indicated significant relationships between self-image, work attitudes, and various attitude questions. A few of those items which were known to be useful indicators were also selected for analysis here.

1. Extent of Future Worries. Respondents were asked at intake if they worried about their futures, and if so, to what extent.

4804

This item was shown to be positively related to better work attitudes and, in general, to a more striving attitude.

Those placed in youth-work programs appeared to be slightly more concerned about their futures than those given direct placements. More of the latter (27 percent) said they worried hardly or not at all than did the former (19 percent): more of those in youth programs said they worried "a little" than did those in direct placements (35 percent and 24 percent respectively). The proportion of those who indicated they worried "a lot" was the same for both groups.

2. Desire to Move to a Different Neighborhood. The proportion of those wanting and not wanting to move to a different neighborhood was the same both for those placed in private employment and those placed in youth-work programs.

3. Respondents' Preferences for Receiving Money or for Working. Applicants were asked at intake whether they would rather just be given money each week or whether they would prefer to be working. There were no differences between those placed in private employment and those placed in youth-work programs in this respect.

Placement Criteria

Since there would appear to be no clear-cut differences between those youths placed in private employment and those placed in youth-work programs, there also would appear to be no clear-cut criteria

4805

in effect by which the intake centers assign applicants. Any expectations that youths who are better trained and more committed to work would be more likely to be placed in regular jobs in the private sector, while those youths having more deficiencies of training and motivation would be assigned to work-training programs such as M.D.T.A., Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, etc., are not fulfilled. If anything, those assigned to work-training programs appear to be slightly more committed to work and to have higher self-image scores, than those given direct placements.

One hypothetical explanation, based on direct observation of center procedures, is that those youths who are somewhat more persistent, patient, and aggressive in waiting out the intake procedures are more likely to be placed in youth-work programs. It was not possible to determine what the procedures were by which applicants were assigned to direct placements.

Since the salary levels in the private sector are considerably higher than those in the work-training programs and, therefore, are more desirable for the applicants, the failure to select applicants for private employment according to clear-cut critera is especially puzzling. But, it is no doubt explainable by the conditions under which the centers operate. As noted earlier, the job openings available to the centers tend to close up rapidly, so that placement officers apparently send out applicants who are immediately available and who meet the apparent minimum requirements, rather than risk

4806

losing the opening by spending several days trying to locate an applicant who may no longer be available.

Table 52

TYPE OF PLACEMENT

A. By Respondents Reporting Training for a Trade			
Have you had training for a trade?	Total 146=100%	Direct Placement 83=100%	Work-Youth Programs 63=100%
Yes	28.8	28.9	28.6
No	71.2	71.1	71.4
B. By Age of Respondent			
Age of Respondent			
16	10.3	4.8	17.5
17	24.0	16.9	33.3
18	22.6	20.5	25.4
19	16.4	18.1	14.3
20 and 21	26.7	39.8	9.5
C. By Highest Grade of School Completed			
Schooling			
9th grade or less	18.5	14.4	23.8
10th grade	26.7	26.5	27.0
11th grade	32.9	32.5	33.3
12th grade and higher	21.9	26.5	15.9
D. By Self-Image Scores			
Self-Image Scores			
Below average	17.1	15.7	19.0
Average	50.0	55.4	42.7
Above average	32.9	28.9	38.1

4807

Table 52
(Con't)

	Total 146=100%	Direct Placement 83=100%	Work-Youth Programs 63=100%
E. By Work-Attitude Scores			
Work-Attitude Scores			
Below average	19.9	21.7	17.5
Average	39.7	39.8	39.7
Above average	40.4	38.6	42.9
F. By Extent of Future Worries			
Extent of Future Worries			
A lot	45.2	45.8	44.4
A little	28.8	24.1	34.9
Hardly/ not at all	23.2	26.5	19.0
Don't know	2.7	3.6	1.6
G. By Desire to Move to Different Neighborhood			
Desire to Move			
Yes	77.7	77.1	78.6
No	22.3	22.9	21.4
H. By Respondents' Preference for Work			
Preference Between Working and Receiving Money			
Want to be given money	10.3	9.6	11.1
Would rather be working	84.2	84.3	84.1
No difference	4.8	6.0	3.2
Don't know	0.7	---	1.6

4808

II. Applicants Placed by the Centers; Respondents and Non-Respondents - Differences Between Applicants placed and Not Placed by the Centers; and between Phase 2 Respondents and Non-Respondents

Age of Respondent

There was no appreciable difference according to age between those placed by the intake centers and those not placed; of the respondents and non-respondents, 16 - and 17-year olds accounted for 40 percent of the respondents and 32 percent of the non-respondents; 20- and 21-year olds accounted for 19 percent and 24 percent respectively.

Table 53

PHASE 2 STATUS AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

			Not Placed by Centers		
Age of Respondent	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
	100%=601	224	377	201	176
16	11.0	11.6	10.6	13.4	7.4
17	25.3	24.6	25.7	26.4	25.0
18	23.5	24.6	22.8	20.9	25.0
19	18.5	17.0	19.4	19.9	18.7
20	13.8	14.3	13.5	10.9	16.5
21	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.5	7.4

4809

Reasons for Coming to Center

Respondents had been asked during theirintake interviews if they had come to the centers primarily for a job that would pay them money, primarily for training, or for a combination of both work and training. The centers appear to have been more successful in placing those who came primarily for training, least successful in placing those who came primarily for jobs, assigning 28 percent of those who came for jobs, 50 percent of those who came for training, and 38 percent of those who came for both. There was no difference between respondents and non-respondents with respect to their reasons for originally coming to the centers.

Table 54

PHASE 2 STATUS BY REASONS FOR COMING TO CENTER

Phase 2 Status	Total	Mostly for Money	Mostly for Training	Both for money & Training	Other (misc.)
	100%=601	187	131	273	10
Placed by centers	37.3	28.3	49.6	37.7	30.0
Not placed by centers	62.7	71.7	50.4	62.3	70.0
Phase 2 Respondents	33.4	39.0	26.7	32.6	40.0
Phase 2 Non-respondents	29.3	32.6	23.7	29.7	30.0

Reason for Coming to Center	Total	Respondents	Non-respondents
	377=100%	201=100%	176=100%
Mostly for money	35.6	36.3	34.7
Mostly for training	17.5	17.4	17.6
Both money and training	45.1	44.3	46.0

4810

Self-image Scores*

It appears that those with low self-image scores are less successful at getting jobs. They were placed somewhat less frequently by the centers (29 percent) than those with average or above average scores (40 percent and 39 percent respectively). There was no difference among respondents and non-respondents, with respect to their self-image scores.

Table 55

PHASE 2 STATUS BY SELF-IMAGE SCORE AT INTAKE

Phase 2	Total	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Status	601=100%	118=100%	302=100%	181=100%
Placed by Centers	37.3%	30.5%	39.7%	38.7%
Not Placed by Centers	62.7	69.5	60.3	61.3
Phase 2 Respondents	33.4	38.1	30.5	34.3
Phase 2 Non-Respondents	29.3	31.4	29.8	27.1

Work-attitude Scores *

The centers appear to have placed those with below and above average work-attitude scores more frequently than those with average work-attitude scores, placing, of these groups, 39 percent of the below-average respondents, 33 percent of the average group, and 42 percent of the above average group. The differences are not great enough to be meaningful. Youths who did not come in for Phase 2 interviews appeared to be no different in their overall work attitude scores from those who did.

---

* See Appendix for individual items.

4811

Table 56

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK-ATTITUDE SCORES AT INTAKE

Phase 2 Status	Total 601=100%	Below Average 122=100%	Average 274=100%	Above Average 205=100%
Placed by Center	37.3	39.3	32.8	42.0
Not placed	62.7	60.7	67.2	58.0
Phase 2 Respondents	53.3	50.0	54.3	53.8
Phase 2 Non-Respondents	46.7	50.0	45.7	46.2

Work-Attitude Questions (Individual Items)

Analysis of response to the following four work-attitude items indicate that there is a slight difference between those placed by the centers, and those not placed:

1. You don't have to work at a job you don't like; you can always go on relief. (See Table 57A) The proportions agreeing among those placed and not placed, were 34% and 39%.

2. On most jobs you don't get ahead by working hard, you get ahead by knowing the right people (See Table 57B.) The proportions agreeing among those placed and not placed were 45% and 49%.

3. Even on a job you dont like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise. (See Table 57C.) The proportions agreeing among those placed and not placed 91% and 85%.

4. Suppose you didn't have to work to get money. Suppose... somebody just gave you the money you need.... Would you like this better or would you rather be working? (See Table 57D.) The proportions preferring work among those placed and not placed are 85% and 80%.

Although none of these differences in response to these four items is great enough to be considered indicative of any striking difference in work attitudes between those placed by JOIN and HARYOU-Act and those not placed, the consistency of response nevertheless makes it plausible to assume hypothetically that those youths who were less work-oriented were less willing or less able to follow up on whatever job opportunities the centers offered them.

Table 57A

"You don't have to work at a job you don' like; you can always go on relief."

			Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total 100%=601	Placed by Center 224	Total 377	Phase 2 Respondents 201	Phase 2 Non-Respondents 176
Total agreeing	36.8	33.5	38.7	36.8	40.9
Total disagreeing	60.2	62.5	58.9	60.7	56.8
Don't know	3.0	4.0	2.4	2.5	2.3

Table 57B

"On most jobs you don't get ahead by working hard; you get ahead by knowing the right people"

			Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total 100%=601	Placed by Center 224	Total 377	Phase 2 Respondents 201	Phase 2 Non-respondents 176
Total agreeing	47.4	45.1	48.8	51.7	45.5
Total disagreeing	48.4	52.2	46.2	42.3	50.6
Don't know	4.2	2.7	5.0	6.0	4.0

4813

Table 57C

"Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise."

			Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total 100%=601	Placed by Center 224	Total 377	Phase 2 Respondents 201	Phase 2 Non-respondents 176
Total agreeing	87.2	90.6	85.1	86.6	83.5
Total disagreeing	9.3	6.2	11.1	10.4	11.9
Don't know	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.0	4.5

Table 57D

"Suppose you didn't have to work to get money. Suppose every week somebody just gave you the money you need... Would you like this better or would you rather be working?"

			Not Placed by Center		
	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-respondents
Response	100%=601	224	377	201	176
Would like to receive money	11.1	8.5	12.7	13.9	11.4
Would rather be working	82.0	85.3	80.1	78.6	81.8
No difference	4.7	4.9	4.5	5.5	3.4
Don't know	2.2	1.3	2.7	2.0	3.4

Miscellaneous Attitude Questions

In all the similarities between those placed by the centers and those not, and between those coming in for Phase 2 interviews and those not responding, outweigh their differences. The following attitude questions selected from the Phase 1 questionnaire were used to determine if the respondents' status three months later

(placed, not placed, Phase 2 respondents, non-respondents) could be associated with differences in attitudes:

"Is the fact that you are not working a problem to your family?"

"When you are out of work, do you worry about not having a job?"

"Do you worry a lot, a little, or not very much?"

"Do you ever think that you would like to live in a different neighborhood"?

"How strongly do you feel you would like to move?"

"Supposing that five or ten years from now you are married and have two children and your wife is not working; how much money per week would you need to support them?"

"Do you think that your chances of earning that kind of money five or ten years are very good, fairly good, or not so good?"

"Would you say you worry about the future a lot, a little, or hardly at all?"

For none of these items, were any significant differences observed in the responses of those placed by the centers and those not placed, or between Phase 2 respondents and non-respondents. (See Tables 58 through 72.)

Miscellaneous Background Data

There appeared to be no relation between those placed and those not placed, and the following characteristics: age; highest grade of school completed; respondents' having had training for a trade; job experience prior to intake at the centers; time spent looking for work' median earned family income (weekly); and intake centers.

Other factors which seemed to have no relation with Phase 2 employment status were: Applicants coming to the centers alone or with friends, applicants reporting that they had told their families they were coming to the centers; applicants reporting that the fact of their not working is a problem to their families; applicants reporting that someone "gives them a hard time" because they are not working. (See tables 58 through 72.)

Table 58

AGE OF RESPONDENTS BY PHASE 2 STATUS

Phase 2 Job Status	Total 100%=601	16 66	17 152	18 141	19 111	20 83	21 48
Placed by Center	37.3	39.4	36.2	39.0	34.2	38.6	37.5
Not placed	62.7	60.6	63.8	61.0	65.8	61.4	62.5
Phase 2 respondents	33.4	40.9	34.9	29.8	36.0	26.5	35.4
Phase 2 non-respondents	29.3	19.7	28.9	31.2	29.7	34.9	27.1

Table 59

PHASE 2 STATUS BY REASON FOR COMING TO CENTER

	Total	Mostly for Money	Mostly for Training	Money and Training	Other (misc.)
Phase 2 Status	100%=601	187	131	273	10
Placed by center	37.3	28.3	49.6	37.7	30.0
Not placed by center	62.7	71.7	50.4	62.3	70.0
Phase 2 respondents	33.4	39.0	26.7	32.6	40.0
Phase 2 non-respondents	29.3	32.6	23.7	29.7	30.0

Table 60

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS' VIEWS OF THEIR JOB CHANCES

A. "What are your chances of being hired?"

			Phase 2 Status		
			Not Placed by Center		
	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-respondents
Response	100%=601	224	377	201	176
Very good	29.6	29.9	29.4	27.4	31.8
About average	56.9	58.0	56.2	58.2	54.0
Not very good	9.5	8.0	10.3	10.0	10.8
Don't know	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.4
B. "How would you expect to get along with the boss?"					
Very well	44.6	46.4	43.5	41.8	45.5
About average	47.9	46.0	49.1	51.2	46.6
Not very well	4.0	4.5	3.7	5.0	2.3
Don't know	3.5	3.1	3.7	2.0	5.7

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS' VIEWS OF THEIR JOB CHANCES

C. "Do you think you work harder than others...?"

			Phase 2 Status		
			Not Placed by Center		
	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-respondents
Response	601	224	377	201	176
Harder	28.1	29.9	27.1	26.9	27.3
About the same	61.9	59.8	63.1	62.7	63.6
Not so hard	6.2	6.7	5.8	7.0	4.5
Don't know	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.5	4.5

4817

Table 60 (cont'd)

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS' VIEWS OF THEIR JOB CHANCES

D. "And about learning to do new things on a job; do you think you can learn them faster than other persons?"

			Phase 2 Status Not Placed by Center		
	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-respondents
Faster	34.9	33.9	35.5	37.3	33.5
About the same	54.1	54.0	54.1	53.2	55.1
Not so fast	6.7	7.1	6.4	6.0	6.8
Don't know	4.3	4.9	4.0	3.5	4.5

Table 61A

PHASE 2 STATUS, BY WORK ATTITUDES

"Work has no dignity in my experience."

Response 100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing	32.9	33.0	32.9	33.3	32.4
Strongly agree	5.0	4.5	5.3	6.0	4.5
Agree	28.0	28.6	27.6	27.4	27.9
Total disagreeing	60.9	59.4	61.8	61.7	61.9
Disagree	50.6	49.1	51.5	51.2	51.7
Strongly disagree	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.4	10.2
Don't know	6.2	7.6	5.3	5.0	5.7

4818

Table 61B

PHASE 2 STATUS, BY WORK ATTITUDES

"Work is the only way to survive in this world."

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
Response 100%=	Total 601	224	Total 377	Phase 2 Respondents 201	Phase 2 Non-Respondents 176
Total agreeing	76.2	74.6	77.2	79.6	74.4
Strongly agree	18.0	17.9	18.0	19.4	16.5
Agree	58.2	56.7	59.2	60.2	58.0
Total disagreeing	21.0	20.5	21.2	19.4	23.3
Disagree	19.9	18.3	19.6	18.4	21.0
Strongly disagree	1.8	2.2	1.6	1.0	2.3
Don't know	2.8	4.9	1.6	1.0	2.3

4819

Table 61C

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"You don't have to work at a job you don't like; you can always go on relief."

			Phase 2 Status			
				Not Placed by Center		
Response	100%=	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
		601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		36.8	33.5	38.7	36.8	40.9
Strongly agree		8.2	7.1	8.8	8.0	9.7
Agree		28.6	26.3	30.0	28.9	31.2
Total disagreeing		60.2	62.5	58.9	60.7	56.8
Disagree		50.9	50.9	50.9	54.7	46.6
Strongly disagree		9.3	11.6	8.0	6.0	10.2
Don't know		3.0	4.0	2.4	2.5	2.3

Table 61D

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"It is better to have a rotten job than no job at all."

			Phase 2 Status			
				Not Placed by Center		
		Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		77.5	75.0	79.0	74.6	84.1
Strongly agree		13.6	12.9	14.1	14.9	13.1
Agree		63.9	62.1	65.0	59.7	71.0
Total disagreeing		19.1	20.5	18.3	22.4	13.6
Disagree		15.8	15.6	15.9	19.9	11.4
Strongly disagree		3.3	4.9	2.4	2.5	2.3
Don't know		3.3	4.5	2.7	3.0	2.3

4821

Table 61E

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"So long as I earn enough money to live decently, I don't care too much what kind of work I do."

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		51.9	52.2	51.7	47.3	56.8
Strongly agree		6.7	7.6	6.1	5.5	6.8
Agree		45.3	44.6	45.6	41.8	50.0
Total Disagreeing		44.6	46.0	43.8	47.3	39.8
Disagree		38.4	39.7	37.7	42.8	31.8
Strongly disagree		6.2	6.2	6.1	4.5	8.0
Don't know		3.5	1.8	4.5	5.5	3.4

4822

Table 61F

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"Work is so interesting that people do it even if they don't need the money."

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
Response		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		65.2	68.3	63.4	64.7	61.9
Strongly agree		8.3	7.1	9.0	9.0	9.1
Agree		56.9	61.2	54.4	55.7	52.8
Total disagreeing		30.3	27.7	31.8	27.9	36.4
Disagree		26.3	25.4	26.8	23.9	30.1
Strongly disagree		4.0	2.2	5.0	4.0	6.2
Don't know		4.5	4.0	4.8	7.5	1.7

Table 61G

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"I expect that during their lives my children will...have better jobs than I will."

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
Response		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		84.4	85.7	83.6	85.6	81.2
Strongly agree		15.8	18.7	14.1	14.4	13.6
Agree		68.6	67.0	69.5	71.1	67.6
Total disagreeing		13.3	12.9	13.5	10.4	17.0
Disagree		10.6	11.2	10.3	8.5	12.5
Strongly disagree		2.7	1.8	3.2	2.0	4.5
Don't know		2.3	1.3	2.9	4.0	1.7

4824

Table 61H

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"On most jobs you don't get ahead by working hard; you get ahead by knowing the right people."

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		47.4	45.1	48.8	51.7	45.5
Strongly agree		8.8	8.5	9.0	8.5	9.7
Agree		38.6	36.6	39.8	43.3	35.8
Total disagreeing		48.4	52.2	46.2	42.3	50.6
Disagree		42.6	47.3	39.8	38.8	40.9
Strongly disagree		5.8	4.9	6.4	3.5	9.7
Don't know		4.2	2.7	5.0	6.0	4.0

4825

Table 61I

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise."

Response	Total	Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
			Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing	87.2	90.6	85.1	86.6	83.5
Strongly agree	12.5	13.4	11.9	11.9	11.9
Agree	74.7	77.2	73.2	74.6	71.6
Total disagreeing	9.3	6.2	11.1	10.4	11.9
Disagree	7.5	4.5	9.3	9.0	9.7
Strongly disagree	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.5	2.3
Don't know	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.0	4.5

Table 61J

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"I would rather have an interesting job for less money than a dull job for more money."

		Phase 2 Status				
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Total agreeing		72.0	72.8	71.6	73.6	69.3
Strongly agree		10.0	10.7	9.5	10.0	9.1
Agree		62.1	62.1	62.1	63.7	60.2
Total disagreeing		24.6	23.2	25.5	23.9	27.3
Disagree		23.1	21.9	23.9	22.4	25.6
Strongly disagree		1.5	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.7
Don't know		3.3	4.0	2.9	2.5	3.4

4827

Table 61K

PHASE 2 STATUS BY WORK ATTITUDES

"Suppose you didn't have to work to get money; suppose every week somebody just gave you the money you need...would you like this better?"

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
	Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response 100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Would like to receive money	11.1	8.5	12.7	13.9	11.4
Would rather be working	82.0	85.3	80.1	78.6	81.8
No difference	4.7	4.9	4.5	5.5	3.4
Don't know	2.2	1.3	2.7	2.0	3.4

Table 62

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS COMING TO CENTERS ALONE OR WITH FRIENDS

"Did you come here alone, or with friends, or with someone else?"

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
	Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response 100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Came alone	68.1	70.5	66.5	69.2	63.6
With friends	19.3	18.3	19.8	18.4	21.5
Brother/cousin	7.2	6.2	7.7	6.0	9.6
Mother	4.2	3.6	4.5	5.5	3.4
Other: wife	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.7

4828

Table 63

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS WHO TOLD FAMILIES THEY WERE COMING TO THE CENTERS

"Did you tell your family you were coming?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	519	195	324	183	141
Yes		85.4	85.6	85.2	88.5	80.8
No		13.7	12.8	14.1	11.5	17.7

Table 64

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS REPORTING THEIR UNEMPLOYMENT AS A FAMILY PROBLEM

"Is the fact that you're not working a problem to your family?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	519	195	324	183	141
Yes		53.9	50.3	56.0	58.5	53.2
No		43.9	47.2	41.9	39.9	44.7
No answer		1.0	.5	1.1	1.6	.7

4829

Table 65

PHASE 2 STATUS BY PREVIOUS TRAINING FOR A TRADE

"Have you ever had any training for a trade?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Yes		31.8	30.4	32.6	32.8	32.4
No		68.2	69.6	67.3	67.2	67.6

Table 66A

PHASE 2 STATUS BY RESPONDENTS WORRY OVER UNEMPLOYMENT

"When you're not working do you worry about not having a job?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Yes		84.9	84.4	85.0	82.6	88.0
No		14.5	14.7	14.3	16.9	1.3
Don't know		.7	.9	.5	.5	.6

4830

Table 66B

PHASE 2 STATUS BY INTENSITY OF WORRY

"Do you worry a lot, some, or a little?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	510	189	321	166	155
Worry a lot		50.2	48.1	51.4	49.4	53.5
Worry some		37.6	40.7	35.8	34.9	36.7
Worry a little		12.2	11.1	12.7	15.7	9.6

Table 67A

PHASE 2 STATUS BY DESIRE TO LIVE IN A DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD

"Do you think that you would like to live in a different neighborhood five or ten years from now?"

			Phase 2 Status			
			Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
		Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response	100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Yes		72.5	71.4	73.2	76.6	69.3
No		20.6	19.2	21.4	20.9	22.1
Don't know		6.8	9.4	5.3	2.5	8.5

Table 67B

PHASE 2 STATUS BY INTENSITY OF DESIRE TO MORE

"How strongly do you feel you would like to move?"

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
100%=	436	160	276	154	122
Very much	54.1	55.0	53.6	53.9	53.2
Not so much	43.1	41.9	43.8	42.9	45.0
Don't know	2.8	3.1	2.5	3.2	1.6

Table 68A

PHASE 2 STATUS BY SALARY NEEDED TO SUPPORT A FAMILY

"Supposing that 5-10 years from now you are married and have 2 children and your wife is not working, how much money per week would you need to support them?"

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
100%=	601	224	377	201	176
$85 or less	6.3	5.4	6.8	8.0	5.6
$86-$95	7.2	5.8	7.9	9.0	6.8
$96-$105	15.6	17.4	14.5	11.4	18.1
$106-$125	13.6	16.1	12.2	11.9	12.4
$126-$145	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.7
$146-$165	20.1	21.4	19.3	17.4	21.5
$166-$185	8.8	7.6	9.5	10.0	9.0
$186-$205	17.6	16.5	18.3	20.9	15.3
$246-$265	3.5	4.5	2.9	3.5	2.2
$266-$285	---	---	---	---	---
$286-$305	1.8	1.3	2.1	2.5	1.7
$306 and over	.8	.4	1.0	1.5	.6
Don't know/ no answer	3.1	2.2	3.7	2.9	4.5
Median	$152	$150	$154	$156	$151

4832

Table 68B

PHASE 2 STATUS BY CHANCES OF EARNING SALARY

"Do you think your chances of earning that kind of money five or ten years from now are very good, fairly good, or not so good?"

		Phase 2 Status			
			Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Very good	32.4	36.6	29.9	30.3	29.5
Fairly good	51.7	50.9	52.2	53.7	50.5
Not so good	9.7	7.1	11.1	10.9	11.3
Don't know/ no answer	5.7	4.9	6.1	5.0	7.3

Table 69

PHASE 2 STATUS BY INTENSITY OF FUTURE WORRY

"Would you say you worry about the future a lot, a little, or hardly at all?"

		Phase 2 Status			
			Not Placed by Center		
Response	Total	Placed by Center	Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
100%=	601	224	377	201	176
Worry a lot	42.9	46.9	40.5	40.8	40.3
Worry a little	32.8	28.6	35.2	34.3	36.3
Hardly at all	11.1	12.1	10.6	10.4	10.7
Not at all	10.3	8.5	11.4	13.4	9.0
Don't know	2.8	4.0	2.1	1.0	3.4

4833

Table 70

PHASE 2 STATUS BY TOTAL EARNED WEEKLY FAMILY INCOME

		Phase 2 Status			
		Placed by Center	Not Placed by Center		
	Total		Total	Phase 2 Respondents	Phase 2 Non-Respondents
Response 100%=	519	195	324	183	141
$45 or less	23.7	21.5	25.0	24.6	25.5
$46-$65	10.0	10.2	9.8	10.9	8.5
$66-$85	7.3	7.2	7.4	8.2	6.3
$86-$105	6.2	7.6	5.2	3.3	7.8
$106-$145	8.5	10.2	7.4	9.8	4.2
$146-$185	5.0	6.7	4.0	2.2	6.3
$186 and over	6.9	9.2	5.6	4.9	6.3
Don't know/ no answer	32.4	27.2	35.4	36.0	34.7

Table 71

PHASE 2 STATUS BY FAMILY STRUCTURE

	Youths Not Placed by Center		
	Total	Respondents	Non-Respondents
Family Structure	377=100%	201=100%	176=100%
Living alone or with friend only	9.8	5.0	15.3
No real or foster parents	25.5	19.4	32.4
With one or more parent	59.7	70.6	47.2
All others	5.0	5.0	5.1

4834

Respondents Asked and Not Asked to Return by the Centers

Sixty-three percent of the 201 Phase 2 respondents reported that they had not heard from the centers after their first intake interview; 37 percent reported that they had heard, and had been asked to return. These groups were compared according to the data obtained at their Phase 1 interviews.

It does not appear that a request to return to the centers is based on any defined policy or procedure with respect to these applicants.

1. Work-Attitude Scores. There was a slight and not statistically significant difference between the scores for those asked and those not asked to return: 38 percent of those asked to return, and 28 percent of those not asked to return had above average work-attitude scores.

2. Self-Image Scores. Those not asked to return appear on the whole to be no lower with respect to self-image scores. Below average self-image scores were slightly more in evidence among those not asked to return (25 percent to 20 percent), but so were above average scores (35 percent to 24 percent).

3. Age. There were no meaningful differences in age between those asked and those not asked to return to the centers.

4. Subsequent Work Experience. Those asked to return by the centers were more apt to have held full-time jobs since intake than

4835

were those not asked to return. Of the former, 70 percent had had jobs during the three months after intake as against 64 percent of those not asked to return; 69 percent of those asked to return were working at the time of their Phase 2 interviews compared with 54 percent of those not asked to return. (None of these differences are statistically significant.) It would seem that the operative factor here is simply a certain amount of passivity on the part of some of these youths, both with respect to the centers and to outside job opportunities.

Table 72

RESPONDENTS ASKED AND NOT ASKED TO RETURN BY THE CENTERS

A. By Work-Attitude Scores at Intake

Work Attitude Scores	Total 201=100%	Asked to Return 74=100%	Not Asked to Return 127=100%
Below average	18.4	11.6	18.9
Average	49.8	44.6	52.8
Above average	31.8	37.8	28.3

B. Self-Image Scores at Intake

Self-Image Scores	Total	Asked to Return	Not Asked to Return
Below average	23.4	20.3	25.2
Average	45.7	55.4	40.2
Above average	30.9	24.3	34.6

C. By Age

Age	Total	Asked to Return	Not Asked to Return
16 and 17 years old	36.3	36.5	36.2
18 and 19 years old	39.8	41.9	38.6
20 and 21 years old	23.9	21.6	25.2

Table 72
(con'd.)

D. By Subsequent Work Experience	Total 201=100%		Asked to Return 74=100%		Not Asked to Return 127=100%	
Subsequent Work Experience	%		%		%	
Had no full-time jobs	33.8		29.7		36.2	
Had held full-time jobs	66.2=100%		70.3=100%		63.8=100%	
Not Working at Phase 2 Interview	26.4	39.8	21.6	30.8	29.1	45.7
Working at Phase 2 Interview	39.8	60.1	48.6	69.2	34.6	54.3

Respondents and Non-Respondents

Of the 377 applicants not placed on jobs or in work programs by the centers during the period of this study, 201 responded to our requests for an interview, 176 did not. This, of course, raises the question of response bias, and the two groups were compared with respect to data gathered during their Phase 1 interviews.

There is no evidence in the data that those not responding were significantly different from those who did come in for interviews. There were no significant or consistent differences between these two groups with respect to attitudinal questions, background data, or self-image and work-attitude scores, except for the following:

1. Age. More younger respondents tended to come in for Phase 2 interviewing slightly than did older ones. Sixteen and seventeen

4837

year olds accounted for 40 percent of the respondents and 32 percent of the non-respondents; twenty and twenty-one year olds accounted for 19 percent of respondents and 24 percent of non-respondents. These differences are not large.

2. Family Situation. Family situation appears to play some role in response and non-response. Youths living alone or with friends accounted for only 5 percent of the respondents, but 15 percent of the non-respondents; those living in miscellaneous family situations without real or foster parents accounted for 19 percent of the respondents but 32 percent of the non-respondents. Those living with one or more real or foster parent had a greater tendency to come in, accounting for 71 percent of the respondents and 47 percent of the non-respondents.

These differences in age and family situation appear to be the only noticeable differences between respondents and non-respondents. And since the data of the Phase 1 study indicated that these are both relatively unimportant variables with respect to their influence on attitudes and behaviour, it does not appear that response bias has played any major part in the data of the Phase 2 report.

SUMMARY OF THE PHASE 1 PANEL

The centers appear to exert little discriminatory judgment of applicants at any level of activity. In every respect in which they were analyzed, applicant resemblances far outweigh their differences;

4838

differences between those assigned by the centers to direct placements and those assigned to youth-work programs were minimal; differences between those placed and those not placed by the centers were minimal; differences between those asked to return to the centers after initial intake and those not asked to return were minimal.

Especially puzzling was the fact that those assigned to youth-work programs had, if anything, slightly higher work-attitude scores than those assigned to jobs in private industry. But one would expect results to be the other way around, and to see sharper differences between youth-work assignees and direct placements.

The conclusion is suggested that the centers might do well to develop - and apply - clearcut guidelines and procedures for the placement of applicants. What seems to occur in practice is that those applicants slightly more aggressive, personable, and patient with respect to center intake procedures have a slight chance of making an impression on counselors, and therefore have slightly better chances of being placed in youth-work programs. Aside from this, however, the only recognizable factor affecting placement appears to be the reluctance of employers in private industry to hire 16 and 17 year olds.

The reasons for this, however, are clear. The centers do not use their files, and the background information contained therein,

4839

in order to place "the right person in the right job." Rather, they attempt to fill the job immediately in terms of any candidate immediately available who possesses the apparent minimum qualifications for the job. First of all, the experience of the centers and of our own interviewing staff reveals that it is often extremely difficult to reach applicants whose records are on file, but who may no longer be living at those addresses. Secondly, the center personnel know that if they do not fill a vacancy quickly, that vacancy will disappear. Thirdly, the centers such as JOIN and HARYOU-Act, though they are official agencies for such programs as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, are only one and a minor source of jobs for private employers. Thus, the centers do not have a wide range of non-governmental jobs available for placement.

Thus, inspite of their best intentions, the centers are not able to operate in a consistent or rational manner with respect to job placements.

The centers, in order to function at a greater level of efficiency, will have to be able to develop a wider range and greater number of jobs and training assignments which will be held open long enough for center personnel to be able to match the right person with the right job.

4840

APPENDIX

SELF-IMAGE AND WORK-ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

I. Self-Image Questions

A. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

B. At times I think I am no good at all.

C. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

D. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

E. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

F. I certainly feel useless at times.

G. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

H. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

I. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

II. Job Chances

A. Suppose a job opening occurred for which five men would be hired. It's a job in which you are interested and qualified. Suppose that 25 men from around New York were called in to be interviewed, and suppose that you were one of these 25 prospects. What would you think of your chance of being hired; would you say it would be very good, about average, or not very good?

B. Now, suppose you were one of the five who were hired for the job. Compared to the other four men who were hired, how would you expect to get along with the boss; would you say very well, about average, or not very well?

C. Do you think you work harder than others, about the same, or not so hard?

D. And about learning to do new things on a job; do you think you can learn them faster than other persons, about the same, or not so fast?

III. Work Attitudes

A. Work has no dignity, in my experience.

B. Work is the only way to survive in this world.

C. You don't have to work on a job you don't like; you can always go on relief.

D. It is better to have a rotten job than to have no job at all.

E. So long as I earn enough to live decently, I don't care too much what kind of work I do.

F. Work is so interesting that people do it even if they don't need the money.

G. I expect that during their lives my children will be able to have better jobs than I will.

H. On most jobs, you don't get ahead by working hard; you get ahead by knowing the right people.

I. Even on a job you don't like, you can learn some things you wouldn't learn otherwise.

J. I would rather have an interesting job for less money than a dull job for more money.

K. Suppose that you didn't have to work to get money. Suppose that every week somebody just gave you the money you need. Would you like this better than working for your money or would you rather be working?

L. From what source would you accept money?